

11 805  
VOL. XL, 4

WHOLE No. 160

THE

GENERAL LIBRARY  
JAN 21 1920  
UNIV. OF MICH.

AMERICAN

# JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1919

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

## CONTENTS.

I.—The Theory of the Homeric <i>Cæsura</i> According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine. By SAMUEL E. BASSETT,	343
II.—Verbals in <i>-tor</i> , <i>-ax</i> , <i>-dus</i> , and <i>-na</i> . By EDWARD W. NICHOLS,	373
III.— <i>Cicero</i> and the <i>Postae Novi</i> . By TENNET FRANK,	396
IV.—Declension Exponents and Case Endings. By EDWIN W. FAY,	416
V.—The Wandering Skull: New Light on <i>Tantrākhyāna</i> 29. By W. NORMAN BROWN,	423
A Correction. By SAMUEL C. CHEW,	430
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	431
<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> . Part XIII.—Hoffman's <i>Everyday Greek</i> .— The New Pauly Real-Encyclopædie (Correspondence).	
REPORTS:	438
<i>Philologus</i> .— <i>Revue de Philologie</i> .	
BRIEF MENTION,	446
ANNOUNCEMENT,	451
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	452
BOOKS RECEIVED,	454
INDEX TO VOLUME XL,	456
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLS. XXXI-XL,	460

The *American Journal of Philology* is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor, Professor C. W. E. MILLER, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XL, 4.

WHOLE No. 160

---

## I. THE THEORY OF THE HOMERIC CAESURA ACCORDING TO THE EXTANT REMAINS OF THE ANCIENT DOCTRINE.

The doctrine of the caesura, especially of the Homeric caesura, holds an important place both in metric and in the teaching and appreciation of Greek verse, yet there are few questions in classical scholarship about which there is more confusion, or wider difference of opinion. This is seen in the variety of reasons given for the phenomenon of caesura of the dactylic hexameter, and in the failure of each of these reasons to be entirely satisfactory. They include the following:

(1) The hexameter is too long for a rhythmical unit (*πὸς μέγιστος*); it therefore consists of two *cola*, and the caesura marks the end of the first *colon*. This, the most commonly accepted explanation of the reason for caesura, is open to several objections. Caesura of the iambic trimeter is not to be explained thus, for this verse does not overstep the limits of a single *πὸς μέγιστος*. Again, in melic poetry the end of a *colon* is not necessarily marked by a word-end, which is recognized as indispensable for caesura by all ancient, and most modern, writers on metric. Furthermore, the acceptance of this explanation has led to unnecessarily rigid conclusions, some modern metricians arguing for only one caesura in the hexameter, and that always in the third foot. But it is perfectly natural, and even desirable, that the constituent *cola* should be of varying length, and that occasionally a hexameter should contain not two, but three, *cola*. The strongest objection, however, lies in the fact that the doctrine of the *πὸς μέγιστος* was established

in the attempt to explain the laws of *melic* poetry. Caesura, on the other hand, is concerned chiefly with the recited trimeter and with the hexameter, which, long before the time of Aristoxenus, had ceased to be sung. The Homeric hexameter is a distinct genre of verse, and we have no means of knowing that the principle of the ποὺς μέγιστος satisfactorily explains the phenomena of its rhythm. In all probability, as we shall see later, Aristoxenus knew nothing about caesura.<sup>1</sup>

(2) The verse composed of a maximum length of 17 syllables is too long to be recited comfortably in a single breath.<sup>2</sup> Doubtless this is true in a certain sense. It does not, however, explain why the caesura should be found only in the third foot and not in any other possible place within the verse, nor does it bar the recognition of many caesuraless verses—which is contrary to the prevailing doctrine—for it is certainly possible, and sometimes even desirable, to pronounce a phrase as long as the hexameter in a single breath. It is to be noticed in passing that this explanation makes caesura a slight *pause*, as the reason given above makes it a musical *hold*, and both without regard to the thought of the verse.

(3) The hexameter is too long for a single syntactical unit.<sup>3</sup> We must postpone the discussion of this statement until we take up the meaning of caesura.

(4) The hexameter, like all verses of six feet, has a tendency to break up into groups of 3 + 3, or 2 + 2 + 2 feet. "Care was taken to counteract this and preserve unity by arranging the words so that in general their divisions and those of the sense should not coincide with places at which the meter of the music was likely to break up" (Verrall in Whibley, Companion to Greek Studies,<sup>1</sup> 625). The use of caesura as a means of binding the verse together has been pointed out also by Lehrs (Aristarchus,<sup>2</sup> 414) and by Professor M. W. Humphreys (Trans. Amer. Philol. Assn. X 26). The frequency with which

<sup>1</sup> On the hexameter as a variety of verse distinct from lyric, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Griech. Lit. 9; for the bearing of this distinction on the doctrine of caesura, White, Verse of Greek Comedy, 52. Professor Goodell makes some excellent remarks on the caesura of the trimeter in Class. Phil., I (1906), 148 f.

<sup>2</sup> Wilamowitz, l. c.; cf. van Leeuwen, Enchiridium, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Christ, Metrik,<sup>1</sup> 186.



the so-called bucolic diaeresis occurs in Homeric verse indicates that this principle must not be applied too strictly.

(5) The hexameter is a compound verse, made up of two shorter verses; the caesura is a survival of the end of the first short verse. This—an entirely modern doctrine—rests upon insufficient evidence, and must be regarded as unproven.<sup>4</sup>

The difference of opinion with regard to the reason for caesura has resulted in a failure to agree on a satisfactory definition of the term. A century ago, Gottfried Hermann, the father of Greek metric in modern times, gave three possible meanings of caesura:<sup>5</sup>

I. Caesura occurs where a word ends within a verse; hence there are as many caesurae as there are word-endings in the verse.

II. In a stricter sense caesura is found only where a rhythmical phrase ends with a word.

III. Since in reciting one must also pay attention to the meaning of the words, the completion of the thought must determine the choice between two or more possible caesurae.

These three statements characterize the three distinct classes into which the great body of modern doctrine about the caesura is divided, according as emphasis is laid upon the metrical, rhythmical or logical nature of the *τομή*. Of course considerable eclecticism is found, but speaking generally, all modern metrists belong to one or other of these three classes.

The metrical theory of caesura, first upheld in modern times by Spitzner (*de versu heroico*, 1816, 3 f.), has the greatest number of adherents. It is the *via media*, and affords room for straying on either side. Hence metrical caesurists are inclined more or less to recognize the value of caesura as a musical hold, or as a logical pause. On the other hand, the supporters of the rhythmical, as well as of the logical, doctrine, are ever and anon constrained by the facts to wander into the neutral area of the metrical caesura.

The rhythmical or musical definition was maintained to the exclusion of the other two, first in modern times by Apel

<sup>4</sup> Cf. K. Witte in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie*, VIII (1913), 2241 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Elementa doctrinae metricae* (1816), 32 ff.

(Metrik, 1814, 336). He has been followed by Lehrs (Aristarchus,<sup>2</sup> 1865, 414, cf. 409); W. Meyer, *Zur Geschichte des griechischen und lateinischen Hexameters*, 1884, 1000; A. Engelbrecht, *Die Caesuren des Hexameters*, in *Serta Harteliana*, 1896, 311, cf. 307, 308; and many of the French writers on metric, e. g., Riemann et Dufour, *Traité de Rythmique et de Métrique grecques*, 1898, chap. I, and especially Masqueray, *Traité de Métrique grecque*, 1899, 49.

The logical caesurists include as protagonists, beside Hermann himself, W. Christ, *Metrik*,<sup>1</sup> 1879, 184 ff., and T. D. Seymour, *Harvard Studies*, III, 1892, 91-129.

One of the most recent, as well as one of the best, discussions of caesura (by the late Professor J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 1912) is decidedly eclectic in its position. The author admits that caesura belongs to recited, and not to melic, verse. Nevertheless, he explains the necessity of caesura by reference to the purely rhythmical doctrine of the *ποὺς μέγιστος* (pp. 7, 152). He likewise recognizes the importance of the definition of caesura given by the Anonymus Ambrosianus (cited below, p. 359), which makes a pause in sense the essential requisite of caesura. Yet in spite of this, he admits caesura at the end of a word where the thought cannot by any reasonable understanding be complete. His discussion has all the disadvantages of the eclectic position, and by no means settles the question. Thus a century of research and criticism has left us still uncertain what value we are to give to caesura in the oral rendering of Homeric verse, for it has failed to make clear the nature of the pause which caesura is said to be.

To illustrate this uncertainty let us take an example, selected from the *Iliad* almost at random (Z 514-516):

καγχαλῶν, ταχέες δὲ πόδες φέρον· αἶψα δ' ἔπειτα  
Ἔκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἀδελφεόν, εὖτ' ἄρ' ἐμελλεν  
στρέψουσθ' ἐκ χώρας, ὅθι ἦ δάριζε γυναικί.

All the rhythmical, and most of the metrical, caesurists would make a pause after *δέ* in vs. 514, and after *ἔτετμεν* in vs. 515, and even Professor White's theory requires a 'secondary pause' in these two places. The present writer and, I am inclined to think, most modern readers of Homer, would make no pause in the oral rendering of these lines, not even at the end of the

verse, which is not required by the sense, and indicated, here at least, by punctuation. The doctrine of caesura, however, as generally understood, stands in the way. For if caesura is a pause, and if there is always a caesura (even a secondary caesura) in the third foot, or if not in the third, at least in the fourth foot, we must make a slight pause after  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  and after  $\xi\epsilon\rho\mu\epsilon\nu$ . We must admit, therefore, that the work of the last one hundred years has left the doctrine of caesura in an unsatisfactory form. This is due largely to the failure to consider the date at which the doctrine came into existence in ancient times, and the widely differing age of the statements about caesura which have come down to us from antiquity. A review of the extant remains of the ancient doctrine may therefore help to remove some of our uncertainty, and lay the foundation for a better understanding of the phenomenon.

$\tau\omicron\mu\eta$  of the verse was probably not recognized either by this name or as a fact until after the beginning of the Roman empire. Certainly Aristotle gives no indication that he knew of its existence.<sup>6</sup> Whether Aristoxenus mentioned the  $\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}$  cannot of course be determined. The probabilities are that he did not, for he was interested rather in melic verse in which, according to the ancient doctrine, caesura is of little importance. Moreover, the fact that the so-called bucolic caesura received its

<sup>6</sup> Some modern scholars cite as evidence that in the time of Aristotle the so-called feminine caesura was known, the following passage from the *Metaphysics* (1093a):  $\beta\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  (sc.  $\tau\omicron$   $\xi\pi\omicron\varsigma$ )  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\tau\hat{\omega}$   $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\hat{\omega}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\alpha$   $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\tau\hat{\omega}$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\hat{\omega}$   $\delta\kappa\tau\acute{\omega}$ , "In scanning the hexameter there are nine syllables on the right, and eight on the left." But, as the present writer has shown, both the statement of the scholiast (Alexander, 832, 33, Brandis) and all the evidence make it plain that the Pythagoreans whom Aristotle is quoting meant by  $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\hat{\omega}$  the *first* part of the verse, and that they were calling attention to the fact that there were more syllables in the first three feet of the verse than in the last three, and were commenting upon the number of syllables in each half (C. P. XI 458 ff. To the modern metricians cited there should be added van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium* 13 f.). Usener, *Altgriechischer Versbau*, 42, who followed Bonitz, *Comment. in Arist. Metaph.*, p. 594 f., in taking  $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\hat{\omega}$  to mean the *second* part of the verse, used the passage in support of the theory that the feminine caesura represents the end of the first of the two short verses from which the hexameter was derived. The investigations of the past generation have shown the weakness of the other arguments of Usener; see K. Witte, *op. cit.* 2242.

name from its frequency in bucolic poetry indicates that the doctrine of caesura was developed after Alexandrian times. Finally, Varro, who is thought to have been familiar with Greek metric and who is the first extant authority to mention the importance of a word-end within the verse, apparently made the discovery for himself.<sup>7</sup> That the doctrine of caesura was not known in Varro's day is further indicated by the silence of Dionysius Hal. In the *De Comp. Verb.*, 26, Dionysius pays considerable attention to the rhythm of both melic and recitative poetry as resembling that of prose, and especially to the variety of rhythms produced by the differing length of the grammatical *κῶλα* and *κόμματα*, but makes no mention of *τομή*. It is hard to believe that if he had known of the theory of caesura he would have failed to mention it. The *terminus post quem* may therefore be placed somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era. The *terminus ante quem* is about one hundred years later. The first Greek definition of *τομή* which has come down to us is that of Aristides Quint., who probably belongs to the third century, A. D. But the doctrine must have been formulated more than a century earlier. We are told by Choeroboscus (Hephaestion, 229, 15, Consbruch) that Hephaestion, who is thought to have lived in the second century, A. D., mentioned the caesurae of the trimeter, and Terentianus Maurus, who was familiar with Greek metric, and who discusses caesura in detail, is now generally assigned to the same century. Finally, Hermogenes, a younger contemporary of Marcus Aurelius, mentions the *τομαί* without comment,<sup>8</sup> showing that the doctrine was well-established by about 150 A. D. We conclude that the doctrine of caesura was formulated during the first hundred years of the present era—long after the great age of Alexandrian scholarship.

Our earliest extant Greek exposition of the doctrine, that of Arist. Quint., is as follows (51 f., M.):—*τομαί δὲ εἰπρεπεῖς αὐτοῦ, πρώτη μὲν ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας εἰς συλλαβὴν, ἢ καὶ διπλασιαζομένη ποιεῖ τὸ*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Aul. Gell. XVIII 15, M. etiam Varro in libris disciplinarum scripsit, observasse sese in uersu hexametro, quod omnimodo quintus semipes uerbum finiret et quod priores quinque semipedes aequae magnam uim haberent in efficiendo uersu atque alii posteriores septem, idque ipsum ratione quadam geometrica fieri disserit.

<sup>8</sup> Hermogenes, *περὶ ἰδεῶν* 390, 21, Rabe, *μέτρων διαφόρων τομαίς*.



ἐλεγείον . . . . . δευτέρα ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας < εἰς δυσύλλαβον >.<sup>9</sup> τρίτη δὲ ἢ μετὰ τρεῖς εἰς συλλαβήν. τετάρτη κατ' ἐνίους, τέσσαρες δάκτυλοι. ἢ, ὅπερ ἄμεινον, τέταρτος τροχαῖος. ἢ γὰρ εἰς ὅμοια μέρη διαίρεσις μᾶλλον ἢ τομή καλεῖται. τομή δέ ἐστι μῦριον μέτρον τὸ πρῶτον ἐν αὐτῷ λόγον ἀπαρτίζον, ὑπὲρ δύο πόδας εἰς ἀνόμοια μέρη διαιροῦν τὸ μέτρον.

"The appropriate *τομαί* of the dactylic hexameter are (1) the *τομή* which ends after two feet and one syllable; by doubling this *τομή* the elegiac verse is obtained. (2) The *τομή* which ends after two feet and two syllables. (3) The *τομή* which ends after three feet and one syllable. (4) Four dactyls or *what is preferable, the fourth trochee*, for the *τομή* which divides the verse into similar parts is called diaeresis, rather than *τομή*. *Τομή* is that portion of a measure which is formed by the first word-end after the second foot, and divides the measure into dissimilar portions."

Since this discussion of caesura plays a most important rôle in the modern doctrine, it is necessary to point out some of its characteristics:—(1) *Τομή* has its original meaning of 'segment,' rather than 'end of a segment.' (2) No names are given to any of the *τομαί*; the adjective 'bucolic' is not applied to the *τομή* which consists of four dactyls. (3) No examples are given. (4) The term diaeresis is preferred to *τομή* for the segment of the verse which is formed by a word-end after the fourth foot. (Aristides is the only one of all our ancient sources to use this term, which has found a wide acceptance among modern scholars.) (5) The *τομαί* are four in number, but there is uncertainty with regard to the fourth, some metricians holding it to be the first four dactyls, that is, the 'bucolic diaeresis,' while in the opinion of Aristides it is better to regard the 'fourth trochaic' as the fourth *τομή*. This is the most unsatisfactory feature of the whole passage. Evidently Aristides derived his doctrine from at least two sources, one of which held that the caesura which we call the bucolic diaeresis was the fourth *τομή*, while the other, because it considered that the function of *τομή* was to divide the verse into dissimilar portions, rejected the bucolic diaeresis in favor of the fourth trochaic. It is easy to see that the first source is the better of the two. We may note in passing that Aristides mentions it first. But far more

<sup>9</sup> So Meibom; Jahn substitutes *εἰς τροχαῖον*.

important than this is the consideration that the observed facts with regard to the place of word-ends—not to mention pauses in thought—in the heroic hexameter debar the fourth trochaic from being considered a caesura in almost any sense in which the word may be taken. In Homer a word-end after the fourth trochee is avoided more than at any other place in the verse, and there is never even a slight pause in the sense. On the other hand, we know that the bucolic diaeresis was a favorite caesura. A word-end occurs at the end of the fourth foot in about 60% of all the verses of the Homeric poems, and a pause in thought—often a full stop—very frequently. This consideration alone should make us extremely cautious about giving great value to Aristides' exposition of the doctrine (including the statement that the function of caesura is to divide the verse into dissimilar portions).

This slighting of the bucolic diaeresis in favor of the fourth trochaic is likewise found in Terentianus Maurus, 1695 f. (Gram. Lat. VI 376), who seems to be following the second source of Aristides, for he does not mention B,<sup>10</sup> and he uses the words *quartus trochaus* to describe the fourth caesura. The weakness of his position with regard to this caesura is apparent from his difficulty in finding an example—which is so great that he is obliged to construct a verse of his own (1700 ff.) :—

*exemplar eius tale confici potest,  
quae pax longa remisera, arma novare parabant:  
quartus trochaus arma fit, rarum est tamen.*

Marius Victorinus agrees closely with Terentianus in discussing the *tomae*, which he calls *incisiones*, but never *caesurae*. He regards 4T as the fourth *incisio*, and cites as an example the verse constructed by Terent. (65, 25, Keil). But he was likewise familiar with the tradition represented by the first source

<sup>10</sup> For the sake of brevity the writer, following White, *Verse of Greek Comedy*, 152, will use the following abbreviations for the different caesurae: P = penthemimeral; T = trochaic (the so-called feminine caesura); H = hephthemimeral; B = bucolic diaeresis; 4T = fourth trochaic, and Tr. = triemimeral (this is a word of modern coinage; trithemimeral is, of course, a monster of word-formation, but it was current during the last century. The ancients, with the exception of Ausonius (see below, p. 352), never refer to a caesura after the first syllable of the second foot).

of Arist., for after stating that the heroic verse must have either P, T, H or 4T, he adds (65, 29, K.) non numquam autem evenit ut in eodem versu plures incisiones, id est penthemimeren et hephthemimeren et eam quae quarto *pede* [caesura] partem orationis terminat, quam bucolicen Graeci dicunt, reperiamus, ut

arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oria

With this passage should be compared p. 114, 17, K., where Mar. Vict. calls the dactylic tetrameter either a verse or the *third tome* of the heroic verse, tetrameter sive versus sive hexametri heroi tome tertia. In both of the passages just cited Mar. Vict. fails to agree with Arist. in the reason which he gives for the distinction between B and the other tomae. He regards B as a caesura—as Arist. did not—but not as one of those which are essential to the heroic verse. It may be that he is trying to harmonize the conflicting theories. There is some likelihood, however, that in the last passage quoted (114, 17, K.) he is following a still different tradition, according to which there were only three *τομαί*, P, H, and B. This tradition is preserved in a fragment of Juba (second century, A. D.): sunt praeterea heroi versus, quibus et Homerus et Theocritus facile usi sunt, qui bucolici dicuntur, quorum caesura non penthemimeres nec hephthemimeres, id est in secundo et dimidio vel tertio et dimidio pede, sed in quarto . . . huius exemplum est

dic age, dic mihi † bove Liburnica, qui colis arva.<sup>11</sup>

Since Juba mentions Homer and Theocritus, we may infer that his source was Greek.

From the sources just cited it is seen that prior to the third century, A. D., no more than four caesurae were recognized in any one formulation of the doctrine, that these four were either P, T, H, B, or P, T, H, 4T, and that in the tradition handed down by Juba there may not have been more than three, P, H, B. As between the first two groups the weight is in favor of the first (P, T, H, B). Indeed it seems probable that 4T was substituted for B by the second source of Arist. because of the notion that a *τομή* was a rhythmical *κόμμα*.<sup>12</sup> But however

<sup>11</sup> In the Frag. Bobiense, Gram. Lat. VI 623, 14.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Atil. Fort. 282, 27, K., Colon est pars, sive partes versus integris pedibus impletae . . . comma pars versus sive partes imperfectae. Cf. Beda, 246, 19, K.

this may have been, the confusion resulting from the two differing sources produced in Byzantine times the doctrine of five *τομαί*, P, T, H, 4T, B.<sup>13</sup> No other caesura is mentioned by any ancient authority, with a single exception.<sup>14</sup> Ausonius (fourth century, A. D.) writes in the introduction to his *Cento Nuptialis* (*Id.* XIII), *diffinduntur per caesuras omnes . . . . aut post dactylum atque semipedem*.<sup>15</sup> That there may be other caesurae is recognized by Priscian (460, 12, K.) and by Joannes Sic. (*Rhet. Graec.* VI 488, Walz), but these are not included among the *ἐνπεσείς τομαί*. By far the greater number of ancient sources recognize only P, T, H, B. These are the unknown author of the *Tractatus Wolfenbüttel* (*Gram. Lat.* VI 645, 25 f.), which is held by Strähler to be, but for the corruption of the text, our best Latin authority on the caesura; Max. Vict., 240, 1, K.; Anon. Ambros. (the Great Anonymus), 215, Studemund; Anon. Ambros. Q. 158, Studemund; also a number of other Byzantine treatises: Ps.-Plutarch, *de metris*, 2; Ps.-Hephaestion, *zur Jacobsmühlen*, 88; Helias Mon., 172, Stude-

<sup>13</sup> Strähler, *de caesuris versus Homerici*, Cap. I, Breslau (1889), 26, who cites these treatises: Ps.-Hephaestion, *zur Jacobsmühlen*, 50; Isaac Mon., Bachmann, *Anec. Graec.*, II 186; Ps.-Draco, Hermann, 126; Anon. Ambros. Q, Studemund, 159; Anon. Chisianus, Mangelsdorf, 9.

<sup>14</sup> The author of the late treatise in Ps.-Hephaestion, 30 (= *zur Jacobsmühlen*, Diss. Argentor. X 274) mentions a caesura after the first syllable of the fifth foot, and calls this *βουκολική*, but he was trying to account for the faulty example of the bucolic diaeresis (Γ 308) which is given in several late definitions of caesura. See the article referred to in Note 15.

<sup>15</sup> Engelbrecht, *op. cit.* 293, cites also Hermogenes, *περὶ ἰδεῶν*, 294, 18, Rabe, where the reference seems to be not to caesura but to a pause in the sense (see below, p. 362), and Priscian, *Gram. Lat.* III 460, 14, *quarta enim [sc. caesura] bucolica magis passio est, sicut hemiepes* (G; hemipes, C; semipes, S) *et quarta trochaica et quae inveniuntur per singulos pedes*. Engelbrecht adopts the reading of C, and by inserting *tertius* makes Priscian refer to the triemimeral. But Keil's reading, that of G, *hemiepes* (i. e., *ἡμιερες*, the forbidden caesura after the third foot), seems clearly the best. It is easy to see how the copyist finding the reading *hemipes*, a simple corruption of *hemiepes*, should have corrected this to *semipes*. On the other hand, if he had before him *semipes*, he would not have been likely to write either *hemipes* or *hemiepes*. That the ancients noticed the presence of a word-end at the middle of the verse is shown by the present writer in an article on *Βουκολικόν* which is to be published in C. P. XV.



mund; Joannes Sic., op. cit. 487; Dion. Thrax, Suppl. III, 123, Uhlig.

The order in which the different caesurae are mentioned throws little light upon the ancient doctrine. There are two possible arrangements, (1) according to the order of importance, and (2) in the order in which they occur in the verse. Aristides and Diomedes alone adopt the second order, P, T, H, B (or P, T, H, 4T). All the rest, with two exceptions,<sup>16</sup> place H before T. (P, H, T, B, or P, H, T, 4T, B.) This is natural for Latin writers, since T is not frequent in the Latin hexameter. But it is strange that all the Greek treatises after Arist., with the single exception of the Great Anonymus, should mention H before T. Apparently for some reason P and H were thought to differ in some way from T. This view finds some support in the evidence from the names of the caesurae. P and H offer no variations from the terms, *πενθημιμερής* (*πενθημιμερίς*) and *ἑφθημιμερής* (*ἑφθημιμερίς*) or their Latin equivalents. B shows somewhat greater variety. As we have seen, Arist. alone calls it, not a caesura, but a diaeresis. The others call it *τετραποδία* (Anon. Ambros. Q. 158 f., Studemund), *tetrapodia* (Diomedes, 497, 5 ff., K.), *tetrametra* (Marius Plotius, 502, 10, K.), or else *βουκολική* (*τομή*) or *bucolice tome*.<sup>17</sup> T in some respects stands quite apart in its nomenclature from the three caesurae already mentioned. Its name is never that of a *μόριον μέτρον*. One writer besides Arist. (Atil. Fort., 284, 28, K.), describes it, without naming it. The rest use *τρίτος τροχαῖος*, *κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον*, *τρίτη τροχαῖκή* (*τομή*) or the Latin equivalents. 4T shows much the same variation in its names. The bearing of this terminology upon the question of the origin of the doctrine of caesura will be discussed later (pp. 364 f.).

Of the five caesurae mentioned by the ancient metricians (P, T, H, 4T, B) 4T is clearly of the least importance. It is not

<sup>16</sup> Priscian, 460, 13, Keil (T, P, H), and the Great Anonymus (H, P, T, B). These exceptions to the usual order seem to have been due to accident or caprice, and apparently have no significance.

<sup>17</sup> Mar. Vict., 65, 33, K., alone of Latin writers, calls this caesura a *divisio*. In doing so he may be following the second source of Aristides, but it is possible that he is using the word in a more general sense, cf. 64, 34, K., *qui herous hexameter merito nuncupabitur, si competenti divisionum ratione dirimatur*.

mentioned by many of the better sources; where it is mentioned no satisfactory evidence is given, and the facts with regard to Homeric versification are all against it. B will be reserved for separate discussion. The three remaining *τομαί* (P, T, H) are mentioned as caesurae without reservation by practically all the ancient sources.<sup>18</sup> Of these the Latin writers seem to have regarded P and H as the chief caesurae: Mar. Vict., 65, 15, K., erunt igitur hae (i. e. P and H) duae tomæ principales, ut dictum est, heroici versus incisiones, quibus similiter et iambici versus trimetri dividuntur. sed his in heroico duo aliae accedunt. nam si harum neutram inveneris, tertium trochaeum conquirit; Ter. Maur., 1685, horum (i. e., P and H) si nihil est, spectane forte trochaeus sit tertius. This is sound doctrine for the Latin hexameter, but seems nevertheless to have been due to Greek sources: both writers use Greek terms in describing caesura, and T is placed after H in all our extant Greek sources except Arist. To this fact is perhaps due the failure of modern metricians to recognize until late in the last century the slightly greater importance of the feminine caesura in the Homeric poems.<sup>19</sup>

The bucolic caesura was regarded as differing somewhat from the other caesurae. This is shown in many ways. Arist. calls it not a *τομή*, but a diaeresis. Terentianus fails to mention it. Mar. Vict. in the passage in which he is following Terent. mentions B only as a secondary caesura, 65, 30, K. Later (114, 17, K.), in discussing the tetrameter, he calls B the third incisio of the heroic hexameter, thus contradicting himself.<sup>20</sup> All the other metricians treat B as a caesura, but often indicate that it is not exactly like the others: it is characteristic rather of Greek pastoral poetry than of the heroic hexameter; it is 'ornatus causa addita' (Maximus Vict., 240, 9, K.); it is 'magis passio' (Priscian, 460, 14, K.), and finally, as will be shown later, it seems to have been regarded from the very beginning as a pause

<sup>18</sup> Juba omits T (see above, p. 351), and Atil. Fort. 284, 25 f., K., fails to mention H and B.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Seymour, Trans. Amer. Philol. Assn. XVI (1885), 30 ff.

<sup>20</sup> He likewise errs in saying that Theocritus, with three or four exceptions, uses this caesura regularly. Clearly he had not read Theocritus, but is simply quoting, perhaps rather carelessly, from one of his sources.

in the sense to a very much greater extent than the other caesurae.

Our ancient sources differ widely in respect to the meaning of caesura. That it is ever regarded as marking the end of a rhythmical or musical *colon* is not entirely clear. The evidence is confined largely to what we have seen reason to believe was the second source of Arist. The latter belonged to the *rhythmici*, and while he treats of the *τομαί* in the metrical part of his treatise, the fact that he describes *τομή* as a *μόριον μέτρον* may indicate that he, or his source, felt the rhythmical, rather than the metrical, force of caesura, and that he was following the teaching of Aristoxenus that the *πὸς μέγιστος* in the hexameter cannot contain more than sixteen *χρόνοι πρώτοι*. But his failure to give examples of the caesurae leaves us in doubt.<sup>21</sup> Mar. Vict. likewise may refer to the rhythmical doctrine when he says (64, 32, K.) *incisiones etiam versuum, quas Graeci τομάς vocant, ante omnia in hexametro heroico necessario observandae sunt (omnis enim versus in duo cola formandus est).*

By far the greater number of our ancient sources determine caesura solely by the ending of a word, without regard either to rhythmical theory or to the thought of the verse. The following represent the Latin metricians:

Atil. Fort. 284, 25, K., *optimus habetur, cuius prima caesura penthemimerim habet orationis parte finitam, ut*

*arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris.*

Frag. Sangall. (Gram. Lat. VI 638, 9), *penthemimeres est syllaba catalectica, quae post duos pedes complet partem orationis. simili modo hephthemimeres est syllaba quae post tertium pedem partem orationis complet, ut hic,*

*arma virumque cano Troiae.*

Frag. Wolfenbüttel (Gram. Lat. VI 645, 26), *penthemimeres caesura fit, quotiens post duos pedes syllaba remanens partem terminat orationis.*

Diomedes, 497, 11, K., *penthemimeres est semiquinaria, ubi post duos pedes et unam syllabam pars orationis expletur.*

Likewise all the Greek treatises after Arist., except the Great

<sup>21</sup> There is no evidence whatsoever for the inference of Engelbrecht, op. cit., 298, that Arist. regarded *τομή* as having anything to do with a pause in sense.

Anonymus. These, some fourteen or fifteen in number, belong to the Byzantine age and are full of errors. Still, the fact that all agree in making a word-end the sole requisite for caesura, indicates that this was the earlier doctrine.<sup>22</sup> The following is a specimen of the Byzantine treatise:—

Anon. Ambros. Q (Studemund, Anec. Var. I 158),<sup>23</sup> καὶ πενθημιμερὴς δὲ λέγεται, ὅτι τῶν πέντε τὸ ἡμῖν ἔχει, τούτῃσι δύο πόδας καὶ μίαν συλλαβήν, οἶον

Ἄτρεϊδη, ποῖον.

ἑφθημιμερὴς δὲ λέγεται, ὅταν μετὰ τοὺς τρεῖς πόδας εὐρεθῇ συλλαβὴ ἀπαρτίζουσα εἰς μέρος λόγου· καὶ λέγεται ἑφθημιμερὴς ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἡμῖν, οἶον

Ἄτρεϊδη, ποῖον σε ἔπος.

κτλ., the same verse (Δ 350 = Ξ 83) being used to illustrate the four caesurae, P, H, T, B, even though this brings the masculine caesura before the enclitic σε. In a similar way the first verse of the Aeneid is used to illustrate P and H (by Maximus Victorinus) and B (by Marius Victorinus). This is good evidence that no pause in sense was thought necessary in order to have caesura.

The doctrine that caesura is a pause in the thought was much less widely held in ancient times. A consideration of the passages which support this view of caesura may help us to gain some idea of its origin. The first metrician who mentions a pause in sense as one of the requisites of caesura is Mar. Vict. (Aphthonius). In one of the two passages from which

<sup>22</sup> Further evidence is found in Hephaestion XV 9 (52, 20, Consbruch): δεῖ δὲ τὸ ἐλεγείον τέμνεσθαι πάντως καθ' ἕτερον (καθ' ἕκαστον, N; κατὰ πρότερον has been conjectured) τῶν πενθημιμερῶν· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔσται πεπλημελημένον, οἶον τὸ Καλλιμάχου,

ιερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκουρίδew γενεή.

Τέμνεσθαι cannot refer to the end of a musical colon, for the vs. which he cites as example of a faulty elegiac might be divided rhythmically into two cola; nor can it refer to a pause in sense, for while a word ends with the penthemimeres, i. e., the first half of the verse, almost invariably, a pause in sense at this point is by no means the rule. Hence Hephaestion must mean that the elegiac verse must be 'cut' by a word-end after two and one-half feet—and it is but a short step from τέμνεσθαι to τομή. This is the interpretation of the scholiast: Διοσκουρίδew· ἡ γὰρ τομή τοῦ πρώτου πενθημιμεροῦς οὐκ ἀπῆρτισεν εἰς μέρος λόγου. λήγει γὰρ εἰς τὸ ΔΙΟΣ· τὸ δὲ δλον μέρος εἰς τὸ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΤΡΙΑΩΝ.

<sup>23</sup> This treatise follows the better tradition of the four *τομαί*.



citations have already been made (64, 31-66, 3; 114, 17-115, 4, K.), there is repeated reference to the completion of the thought. Unfortunately the verses which are used as illustrations contradict the statements and so detract greatly from their value. The two passages may be summarized as follows:—

(1) The penthemimeral is formed by a word-end; by doubling P we obtain the pentameter,<sup>24</sup> e. g.,

quam Juno fertur quam Juno fertur.

The second *τομή* is the hephthemimeral, quae tribus pedibus emensis adicit syllabam *completque sensum* quacumque orationis particula, e. g.,

Quam Juno fertur terris.

nam post tres pedes suprema RIS syllaba *sensum complet*. These are the principal *tomae*. But there are two others, for if you find neither P nor H, look for T, which is the penthemimeres with the addition of a syllable, e. g.,

Infandum, regina, (jubes renovare dolorem),

for GINA is a trochee in the third foot. BES autem syllaba et sensum superioris coli integrat, ut fiat hephthemimeres, et sequentis pedis initium inducit. [This statement is most unsatisfactory. After saying that T may be found in a verse in which neither P nor H occur, he cites as an example of T a verse in which he admits that the end of the first *colon* is found at H. Again, he says nothing of a pause in sense at T, where there is a slight pause in his example, but states that the sense of the hephthemimeral *colon* ending with 'jubes,' is complete, which is not true according to the normal interpretation of the words.] 4T (a rare caesura) is much like T. Every heroic hexameter must have one of these four caesurae (P, H, T, 4T). It sometimes happens that in the same verse will be found P, H, and B, e. g.,

Arma virumque cano Troiae qui primus ab oris.

nam IAE QUI, pes in verso quartus, eam divisionem [i. e., *διαιρέσειν*—another indication that Marius is following one of the sources of Arist., but see note 17, p. 353] explicat, quam

<sup>24</sup> Note the closeness with which this statement follows that of Arist. (see above, p. 348).

bucolicen vocari dictum est, sub qua quattuor pedum *sensus impletur* [again there is no pause in sense where Marius says the sense is complete, i. e., at the bucolic diaeresis].

(2) In the second passage (114, 17 ff., K.) P and H are merely mentioned, while B is described at some length: *tertia est ea, quam βουκολικὴν appellant, quae quarto pede semper sensum claudente distinguitur ideoque a Graecis sic appellatur . . . . ., ut ante duos ultimos quarto pede terminet aut partem orationis aut sensum, quam legem per omne opus sui carminis Theocritus Syracusanus exceptis tribus aut quattuor ferme versibus . . . . custodit.* The phrase *semper sensum claudente* in this passage suggests the possibility that a pause in the thought was first noticed at the bucolic diaeresis and later transferred to the doctrine of the other caesurae. Certainly Mar. Vict. is an eclectic, at least, for he regards caesura (1) as being determined by a word-end, (2) as being marked at least to a slight extent by a pause in sense and (3) as marking the end of a *colon* (cf. above, p. 355). The Wolfenbüttel treatise (Gram. Lat. VI 645) agrees with Mar. Vict. in giving us some reason to believe that B was determined by a pause in sense to a greater extent than any of the other caesurae, for while, according to this treatise, P, T and H are determined solely by the ending of a word, "tetarte bucolicon"<sup>25</sup> fit, cum in quarta regione pars orationis cum fine sensus dactylo terminatur, his exemplis,

degeneres animos timor arguit, heu quibus ille,  
nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia solus."

The only clear statement that caesura in general is determined solely by a distinct pause in the thought is found in the Great Anonymus (Studemund, Anec. Var. I 215, 23-216, 12). The date of this treatise is uncertain. Strähler calls attention to the rhetorical style and the use of *συναπολόγειν*, which is not found elsewhere before the time of Philostratus. It may be added that the writer is a Christian (p. 230, 9 f.). But although

<sup>25</sup> That is *βουκολικῶν*, according to some scholars. In view of the second example, however, which contains no B, but has a word-end in the exact middle of the verse, it seems probable that the unknown writer confused the bucolic diaeresis with the *βουκολικὸν ἔπος*. See the present writer's discussion of this term in C. P. XV 54-60.

the author must be placed perhaps as late as early Byzantine times, his exposition of the doctrine is the most consistent of all that have come down to us. The fourth trochaic is not mentioned; there is no ambiguity, or at most only a slight one (in the definition of T), and the examples are all, without exception, excellent. The only criticism which may be made is that H is mentioned before T. The whole passage is worth citing:

χρὴ δὲ ἡμῶς μὴ μόνον τῆς ἀκριβείας τῶν μέτρων ἀντέχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς καλουμένης ἀντιποιεῖσθαι τομῆς. τομὴ δὲ τῶν στίχων ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὃ δεικνύς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἔπους διάνοιαν στιγμὴν ἔπι-  
τηδεῖως λαμβάνουσιν. διαφορὰς δὲ ἔχει τέσσαρας ἡ τομὴ·  
ἐφθημμερῇ τε καὶ πενθημμερῇ καὶ τρίτον τροχαῖον καὶ τετάρτην βου-  
κολικὴν.

ἐφθημμερὴς μὲν καλεῖται τομή, ἥτις μετὰ τρεῖς πόδας καὶ συλλαβὴν  
τέλειον ἔχει τὸ νόημα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδευεν δ' ὁ γέρον, καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ.

ὃ ἐστὶν τῶν ἑπτὰ τὸ ἥμισυ.

πενθημμερὴς δὲ ἐστὶν, ἥτις μετὰ δύο πόδας καὶ συλλαβὴν τέλειον ἔχει  
τὸ νόημα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος.

ὃ ἐστὶ τῶν πέντε τὸ ἥμισυ.

τρίτος δὲ τροχαῖός ἐστιν ἡ ἔχουσα τὸν πόδα τὸν τρίτον εἰς τροχαῖον  
συναπολύγοντα, οἶον

ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε.

τετάρτη δὲ ὑπάρχει βουκολικὴ ἡ ἔχουσα τὸ νόημα εἰς τέταρτον πόδα  
πάντως [cf. *semper* in the passage cited from Mar. Vict. above,  
p. 358] ἀπαρτιζόμενον, οἶον

οὐρήας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπώχετο.

καὶ πάλιν

βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων.

ταύτῃ δὲ τῇ τομῇ πάντες οἱ τὰ βουκολικὰ ποιήματα γράψαντες ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ  
πλείστον<sup>20</sup> χρῆσάμενοι φαίνονται· ὅθεν καὶ τὴν κλήσιν ἡ τομὴ ταύτην ἐδέ-  
ξατο, ἀπὸ τῶν χρησαμένων τὴν προσηγορίαν λαβοῦσα.

It is clear that the doctrine of the metrical caesura (i. e. caesura as formed by the end of a word without reference to the sense) has no recognition in the Great Anonymus, with the

<sup>20</sup> Note the moderation of this statement in comparison with that of Mar. Vict. (see above, p. 354, note 20).

possible exception of the feminine caesura, where the omission of 'completion of the thought' seems to have been an oversight. And yet some modern metricians, e. g., Engelbrecht<sup>27</sup> and White,<sup>28</sup> while giving prominence to this definition of caesura, have so arranged their theory as to admit caesura where there is no real pause in the thought—certainly not sufficient for punctuation. This seems to be not only unjustifiable, but altogether unnecessary. The more probable solution of the conflict between the rhetorical and the metrical definitions of caesura seems to lie in supposing that there were two distinct doctrines, that the Anonymus represents a different source from that of most of the other metricians, and that he is almost alone in this, although we have seen possible indications of this source in Mar. Vict. and in the Wolfenbüttel treatise. We may even hazard a conjecture as to the origin of this new doctrine. It seems to have come partly from the observation that in the Greek bucolic poetry a pause in sense,<sup>29</sup> completion of the thought, anaphora, etc., are often found at the end of the fourth foot. This observation, be it noted, belongs not to metric, but to rhetoric. We have strong evidence that this view of caesura as a pause in the thought had its origin in the rhetorical (and possibly grammatical) studies in the early Greek hexameter poetry.

The first passage of importance is Dion. Hal., *de comp. verb.* chap. 26. *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐμμελοῦς καὶ ἐμμέτρου συνθέσεως τῆς ἐχούσης πολλὴν ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὴν πεζὴν λέξιν τοιαῦτά τινα λέγειν ἔχω· ὡς πρώτη μὲν ἐστὶν αἰτία κἀνταῦθα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅνπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμέτρου ποιητικῆς, ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν ἁρμογή· δευτέρα δέ, ἡ τῶν κῶλων σύνθεσις· τρίτη δέ, ἡ τῶν περιόδων ἐμμετρία (συμμετρία, Roberts with M). τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει κατορθοῦν τὰ τῆς λέξεως μόρια, δεῖ πολυειδῶς στρέφειν τε καὶ συναρμόττειν, καὶ τὰ κῶλα ἐν διαστήμασι ποιεῖν συμμέτρως, μὴ συναπαρτίζοντα τοῖς στίχοις, ἀλλὰ διατέμνοντα τὸ μέτρον, ἀνισά τε ποιεῖν αὐτὰ καὶ ἀνόμοια· πολλάκις δὲ*

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit., 297; Engelbrecht thinks (without good reason, in the opinion of the present writer) that a pause in sense is indicated in Arist. (l. c.), in Ps.-Draco, p. 128, and in the Tractatus Harleianus, p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> Op. cit., where considerable importance is attached to the definition given by the Great Anonymus.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. once more the use of *semper* in Mar. Vict., and of *πάντως* by the Great Anonymus, with reference to completion of the thought at B.



καὶ εἰς κόμματα συνάγειν βραχύτερα κώλων, τὰς τε περιόδους μήτε ἰσομεγέθεις μήτε ὁμοιοσχήμονας τὰς γοῦν παρακειμένας ἀλλήλαις ἐργάζεσθαι. . . . .

ὣν δὲ προϋθέμην τὰ παραδείγματα θεῖς, αὐτοῦ κατακλείσω τὸν λόγον. ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐπικῆς ποιήσεως ταῦτ' ἀπόχρη (ξ 1-7).

αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἐκ λιμένος προσέβη τρηχεῖαν ἀταρπόν·

ἐν μὲν δὴ τοῦτο κῶλον. ἕτερον δὲ

χωρον ἀν' ὑλήεντα·—

ἐλαττόν τε τοῦ προτέρου, καὶ δίχα τέμνον τὸν στίχον. τρίτον δὲ τουτὶ

—δι' ἄκριας·—

ἐλαττον κώλου κομμάτιον.

—ἦ οἱ Ἀθήνη

πέφραδε δῖον ὑφορβόν—

ἰξ ἡμιστιχίων δύο συγκείμενον, καὶ τοῖς προτέροις οὐδὲν ἐοικός. ἔπειτα τὸ τελευταῖον·

—ὃ οἱ βιώτοιο μάλιστα

κῆδετο οἰκῶν, οὓς κτήσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς·

ἀτελῇ μὲν τὸν τρίτον ποιοῦν στίχον, τοῦ δὲ τετάρτου τῇ προσθήκῃ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἀφηρημένον. ἔπειτ' αὖθις

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ εὖρ' ἤμενον·

οὐ συνεκτρέχον οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῷ στίχῳ.

—ἐνθα οἱ αὐλῇ

ὑψηλῇ δέδμητο·—

ἄνισον καὶ τοῦτο τῷ προτέρῳ. καίπειτα ὁ ἐξῆς νοῦς ἀπερίοδος ἐν κώλοις τε καὶ κόμμασι λεγόμενος· ἐπιθεῖς γὰρ

—περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ·

πάλιν ἐποίσει

καλὴ τε μεγάλη τε—

βραχύτερον κώλου κομμάτιον. εἴτα

—περίδρομος—

ὄνομα καθ' ἑαυτὸ νοῦν τινα ἔχον. εἴθ' ἐξῆς τὰ ἄλλα τὸν αὐτὸν κατασκευάζει τρόπον. τί γὰρ δεῖ μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον;

In this passage we must notice two points, (1) that Dionysius calls attention to the divisions of the hexameter which are made by various short grammatical phrases and units of thought, and (2) that he actually refers twice (lines 9, 18, διατέμνοντα τὸ μέτρον, τέμνον τὸν στίχον) to the 'cutting' of the hexameter

into two sections by the grammatical *κῶλα* and *κόμματα*. It would be easy to apply this observation of Dionysius to the doctrine of the *τομαί* when that doctrine had been fully established, probably sometime during the following century. And this is just what happened, for Hermogenes, who lived about 150 years after Dion., treats the caesura and the pause in sense as of like effect in producing a variation of the rhythm (*περὶ ἰδεῶν*, p. 394, 18 Rabe) *ἐξίσταται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ οἰκείου πολλάκις τὸ μέτρον ῥυθμοῦ κατὰ τὰς ποιάς τῶν στίχων τομὰς καὶ ἀναπαύσεις ἐννοιῶν κατὰ τὰ κῶλα. τὸ γούν*

(*ἡρώων*·) αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλῶρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν

*ἀναπαιστικόν πὼς ἐστίν, γενομένης ἀναπαύσεως ἐν τῷ 'ἡρώων'.* We cannot be absolutely certain that Hermogenes regarded *τομή* as a pause in sense, but the probabilities are that he did. The pause after *ἡρώων* is not a *τομή*, for the triemimeral caesura was not recognized as early as 150 A. D., but only an *ἀνάπαυσις ἐννοίας*, and Hermogenes gives no other illustration of the influence of *τομή* and pause in sense upon the rhythm. But at least we may conclude that in the use of 'caesura' and 'pause in sense' together a second step had been taken towards the establishment of the theory of the logical caesura.

While rhetoricians were noticing the *cola* and *commata*, the variety in their arrangement, and their effect upon the rhythm of the Homeric verse, the pauses in the thought of Homeric poetry were being examined from another point of view by Nicanor, the Punctuator (*ὁ Στιγματίας ἐπικληθεὶς*, Eustathius, 20, 12), a contemporary of Hadrian. No reference to caesura is found in any of the fragments which may be referred with certainty to Nicanor. The latter, however, notes the frequency of punctuation at the places where the metricians place the *τομαί*. Furthermore, there is a scholium (on A 356; Friedländer, Nicanor, 129) in which it is stated that *τομή* is rare after the *ἑβδομος χρόνος* (the first short syllable of the second foot). This mention of *ἑβδομος χρόνος* is a sure sign of Nicanor, or at least of his doctrine. Friedländer holds that the scholium cannot be the work of Nicanor, for the latter could not have meant that a caesura was rare at this point in the verse, since a word ends with the first short syllable of the second foot in 21 of the first 100 verses of the Iliad, and in 10 of the first 100

of the Odyssey. This reasoning is hardly sound, for—aside from the fact that Friedländer begs the question of what a caesura is—no *τομή* was recognized, as we have seen, in the first two feet of the verse, at least, as early as Nicanor. Rauscher (*de scholiis Homericis ad rem metricam pertinentibus*, Strassburg, 1886, 30 f.) assigns the statement to Nicanor, but emends by reading *στιγμή* for *τομή*, since punctuation, although found with varying degrees of frequency elsewhere in the first two feet of the hexameter, is in fact rare after the second trochee.<sup>30</sup> This emendation is unnecessary. The inference is rather that by the time of the scholiast caesura had come to mean, at least among the rhetorical writers, a pause in sense sufficient for punctuation. The scholium cannot belong to Nicanor, for the doctrine that *any* pause in the thought within the verse of Homer is a *τομή* is very late: Joannes Sic., *Rhet. Graec.* VI 488, Walz, αἱ μὲν οὖν ὀνομασται τομαὶ καὶ γνώριμοι τοσαῦται καὶ αὗται. αἱ δὲ ἀφανεῖς καὶ γανθάνουσαι καὶ ποιῶσαι δοκεῖν τὰ μέτρα πεζὰ καὶ διάφορα τῷ εἶδει πάμπολλαι· ἐν αἷς γὰρ ἀπαρτίζεται τις ἔννοια καθ' ἑαυτήν, τομαὶ αὗται λέγουντο ἂν εἰκότως.

We may now venture a theory of the origin and development of the doctrine of caesura in ancient times. We have good reason for believing that it arose sometime between the age of Augustus, when it was not known, and that of the Antonines, when it was fully established, that is, it was probably formulated during the first century of the Christian era. We may take it for granted that it originated among the Greek, rather than among the Latin, metricians in view of the nomenclature, *tome*, *bucolice*, *penthemimeres*, etc. If we try to find a Greek metrician who, if not the originator, may at least be regarded with some probability as the sponsor, of the doctrine, three names at once suggest themselves, Philoxenus, Hephaestion and Heliodorus. Of these the first may be discarded at once for lack of evidence. Apparently he had less influence upon later metricians than either of the other two.<sup>31</sup> Hephaestion, who is thought to have lived about the time of the Antonines, is too late, for Hermogenes refers to the doctrine as if it were already fully established. There remains Heliodorus. He is called

<sup>30</sup> Cf. also Rossbach-Westphal, *Metrik*,<sup>2</sup> 64 f.

<sup>31</sup> Gleditsch, *Metrik*,<sup>2</sup> 71.

μετρικός by Suidas, and is characterized by Mar. Vict.<sup>32</sup> as "inter Graecos huiusce artis antistes aut primus aut solus." Gleditsch assigns the floruit of Heliodorus to about the time of Hadrian. But this is probably too late, for, as Hense has shown,<sup>33</sup> Irenaeus (Minucius Pacatus), a pupil of Heliodorus, is cited in the Hippocratic glossary of Erotian, who lived at the end of the first century. This would make the floruit of Heliodorus about the middle of the first century, A. D.,<sup>34</sup> which is exactly the time at which the doctrine of caesura is likely to have arisen. A further reason for thinking that the original sponsor for the doctrine was Heliodorus is the fact that he was especially interested in colometry, and wrote a famous colometric edition of Aristophanes.<sup>35</sup> This interest in the *cola* of melic verse might easily have led him to notice, in his work on metric, the *cola* of the hexameter. There is evidence that something like this may have been the case. Hephaestion, in discussing the dactylic meter (Enchiridion, VII), mentions among its various forms πενθημιμερής, ἐφθημιμερής and τετράμετρον (ἀκατάληκτον), and these were the terms, as we have seen, which were regularly applied to the caesurae, P, H, and B. Again, we notice that some of the early metricians regarded τομή as a part of the verse (μόριον, incisum). Finally, Arist., in his description of the caesurae, uses language which in some respects suggests that of Hephaestion when the latter is describing the shorter dactylic meters.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>32</sup> 94, 7, K.: see Gleditsch, l. c.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Pauly-Wissowa VIII 28 f.

<sup>34</sup> It cannot have been much earlier, for Heliodorus himself refers to Seleucus Grammaticus, who lived in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (Hense, in Pauly-Wissowa VIII 28 f., who refers to Leo, Hermes XXIV (1889), 284).

<sup>35</sup> Hense, Heliodorische Untersuchungen, 1879; White, op. cit., 384 ff.

<sup>36</sup> Hephaestion, Aristides, 51 f., M.

τῶν δὲ εἰς συλλαβὴν τῷ μὲν  
πενθημιμερεῖ πρὸς δύο ποσὶν οὐσῶν  
τῶν συλλαβῶν Ἀρχιλοχὸς κέχρηται  
(Cap. vii).

τῷ δὲ ἐφθημιμερεῖ Ἀλκμάν (ibid).  
δεῖ δὲ τὸ ἐλεγείον τέμνεσθαι  
πάντως καθ' ἕτερον τῶν πενθημιμερῶν  
(Cap. xv, 8).

πρώτῃ μὲν (sc. τομῇ) ἢ μετὰ δύο πόδας  
εἰς συλλαβήν.

τρίτῃ δὲ μετὰ τρεῖς εἰς συλλαβήν.  
ἢ (= πενθημιμερὲς τομή) καὶ διπλασιαζο-  
μένη ποιεῖ τὸ ἐλεγείον.



The suggestion that the doctrine of caesura may have been formulated first by Heliodorus of course admits of no proof, and after all is of slight importance in comparison with the question of the signification of caesura in the ancient metric. This may be summarized as follows:

(1) At first the caesurae were parts of the hexameter, not the ends of parts.

(2) These parts were made to correspond to recognized dactylic measures, the shortest of which was the trimeter catalectic ending in one syllable (= the *πενθήμερος* of Hephaestion VII).<sup>37</sup>

(3) In applying this doctrine the frequency of T was noticed, and a new *τομή* was added. This did not correspond to a recognized dactylic measure, and perhaps for this reason seems to have been regarded quite generally as of somewhat less importance than either P or H.

(4) Some time before Aristides, the so-called bucolic diaeresis was discarded by some unknown metrician. As tradition required four caesurae—or for some other reason—the fourth trochaic caesura was substituted. It is not supported by the facts of Homeric versification, but corresponds to a dactylic measure, for Hephaestion (VII) tells us that the dactylic tetrameter catalectic ending in two syllables was employed by Archilochus.

(5) The caesura came into prominence by reason of its analogy to the metrical units which are found within the hexameter, but later, as the doctrine was passed on from one metrician to another, it came to mean, not a part of the verse, but the ending of a word within the third or fourth foot, or else at the end of the fourth foot. Whether caesura was felt to be a real pause greater than at the end of a word in any other place in the verse will be discussed later (p. 368). At all events *ancient metricians who do not regard a pause in the thought as essential to caesura never call a caesura a pause.*

(6) Caesura as a pause in sense does not belong to the earlier doctrine. It arose largely, if not solely, from the grammatical

<sup>37</sup> The Adonius is not recognized as a verse by Hephaestion, and, moreover, a word-end after the second foot of the hexameter is avoided. That the triemimeral received no consideration is explained by the fact that the dactylic dimeter catalectic is not found as a distinct verse.

and rhetorical study of Homer, and was not incorporated into the metrical doctrine until later.

It remains to examine the ancient sources with reference to the effect of caesura upon the rhythm of the verse. Unfortunately, the evidence—which agrees with the facts of versification in all languages belonging to the same branch as the Greek and Latin, although not with all theories of caesura—is late, fragmentary and far from clear. We may distinguish two theories:

(1) The caesura produces a change in the rhythm, e. g., from dactylic to anapaestic.<sup>38</sup> This theory is found only in Hermogenes, in two passages of his work,

καὶ μέτρων διαφόρους τομάς, ἐξ ὧν καὶ διάφορά πως συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι τὰ μέτρα καὶ ταῦτα ἐν δέοντι καὶ κατὰ λόγον μεταβαλλόμενα (390, Rabe).

ἐξίσταται γὰρ τοῦ οἰκείου πολλάκις τὸ μέτρον ῥυθμοῦ κατὰ τὰς ποιὰς τῶν στίχων τομάς καὶ ἀναπαύσεις ἐννοιῶν κατὰ τὰ κῶλα (394, Rabe).

(2) Caesura makes the verse 'lighter,' that is, less like prose, by avoiding the monotonous coincidence of word-ends and metrical feet: Priscian, Gram. Lat. III 460, 16, caesurae vero cursum et rhythmum leviores solent facere, et necesse est vel unam vel duas caesuras in versu inveniri. nam tres rarissime possunt in eodem versu esse. The bearing of the second part of this statement is important, for if two, and sometimes three, of the four recognized caesurae may be found in the same verse, caesura cannot be a distinct pause in the thought. Priscian is not alone in admitting more than a single caesura in the same verse. We have seen that Mar. Vict. allows P, H, and B in one verse, and that in a Byzantine treatise P, T, H and B are all illustrated by a single example.<sup>39</sup> To these passages we may add one from Diomedes (498, 15 ff. K.), hae incisiones, quas Graeci tomas appellant, figuris formantur tribus, simplici composita conjuncta. simplex est cum invenitur una incisio, ut est

panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi—P.

composita cum duae inveniuntur, ut est

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Seymour, *Homeric Language and Verse*, 86.

<sup>39</sup> Pp. 357, 358.

infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem—T. and H.  
conjuncta<sup>40</sup> cum tres inveniuntur,<sup>41</sup> ut est

talibus Ilioneus, cuncti simul ore fremebant—P, H and B.

The 'lightening of the rhythm' by conflict between word and metrical foot was thought to be more necessary in the middle of the verse than towards the beginning or the end: Aul. Gell., XVIII 15, in longis versibus, qui 'hexametri' vocantur, item in senariis, animadverterunt metrici primos duos pedes, item extremos duos, habere singulos posse integras partes orationis, medios haut umquam posse, sed constare eos semper ex verbis aut divisis aut mixtis atque confusis (then follows the observation of Varro, cited above, p. 348, note 7).

These passages and the description of the various caesurae

<sup>40</sup> A slightly different definition of the figura conjuncta is found in the catechetical fragment de metris et de hexametro heroico of a certain Victorinus, who is to be distinguished alike from Mar. Vict. and from Max. Vict. (Gram. Lat. VI 214, 23; cf. Beda, Gram. Lat. VII 245, 17): Quot sunt species in caesura hexametri versus? Quattuor. Quae sunt? Conjunctus districtus mixtus divisus. Conjunctus qui est? Qui in scandendo ita concatenatus est sibi, ut nusquam finito sensu divisa inter se verba ponantur, quod genus versificationis laudabile habetur, ac melius, ut puta veluti est

infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem,

that is, the sense must not be complete at any point in the verse, and the words must be so placed as not to end with any of the metrical feet. This definition, when taken in connection with the passage from Diomedes and with a statement of Priscian in the passage from which citation has just been made, contains the only justification which is to be found in our ancient sources for the theory that caesura is, as some modern scholars hold, the cutting of any foot by a word-end. The words of Priscian are as follows: quarta enim (caesura) bucolica, sicut hemiepes et quarta trochaica et quae inveniuntur per singulos pedes.

<sup>41</sup> The ancient statements that more than one caesura may be found in the same verse have given rise in modern times to the controversy over the position of the 'main caesura' (e. g., Masqueray, op. cit., 48-50), and to the arbitrary and confusing terms which are used, especially by German scholars, to describe 'main' and 'subordinate' caesurae: 'podic' and 'rhythmic' (Munk); 'primariae' and 'ordinariae' (Koechly); 'maiores' and 'minores' (Strähler); 'Versabschnitt' and 'Verseinschnitt' (Lehrs and Engelbrecht); 'Hauptcäsur,' 'Nebencäsur' and 'Ersatzcäsur' (Meyer), etc. It may be added that the terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' as applied to caesura have no ancient authority.

which have been quoted in the discussion of the ancient doctrine of the metrical caesura (p. 355), seem to show that the ancient *metricians* regarded caesura, not as a pause, but as a conflict between word and foot in certain preferred places in the verse. This is put beyond reasonable doubt by a passage in Eustathius (ad Iliad., IX 122, p. 740, 1 ff.) :

ἔπτ' ἀπύρους τρίποδας, δέκα δὲ χρυσοῖο τάλαντα,  
αἰθωνας δὲ λέβητας εἴκοσι, δώδεκα δ' ἱππους.

τούτων δὲ τῶν στίχων ἑκατέρου ἢ εἰς δύο ἐννοίας τομὴ οὐ πάνυ μετρικῶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἱ φασιν ὅτι τὸ μέτρον χαίρει μὲν συνδεσμεῖσθαι τοὺς πόδας ἀλλήλοις, ὡς κατὰ μηδὲν εἰς μέρος ἀπαρτίζειν λόγου, οἶον

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσε.

παρατεῖται δὲ ὥς περ τὸ κατὰ πόδα τέμνεσθαι, οἶον

Ἵβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε, σὺ δ' ἴσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.

οὕτω καὶ τὴν δίχα τομὴν ἡγουν τὴν εἰς δύο ἐννοίας, ὡς τὸ

ἐνθ' οὗτ' Ἰδομενεὺς τλῇ μέμνειν, οὗτ' Ἀγαμέμνων.

οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν τριχῇ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείον διαίρεσιν. ῥυθμικὰ γάρ φασιν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ μετρικὰ. οὐκοῦν καὶ τὰ ῥηθέντα δύο ἔπη ῥυθμικώτερον διάκειται. "The early metricians admired the verse in which there was conflict throughout between words and metrical feet,<sup>42</sup> and disliked equally the absence of conflict and a pause in the thought which divides the verse into two or three equal parts. This division, they asserted, is a matter of 'rhythm' rather than of meter. Hence verses like Iliad IX 122 f., which contain one or more pauses in sense, are better 'rhythmically' than 'metrically.'" If the sharp distinction between ῥυθμικά and μετρικά correctly preserves the tradition of the παλαιοὶ μετρικοί, we must conclude that the *τομή* of the metricians was in no sense a pause, and further, that the only pauses which were made in the oral rendering of the Homeric poems, at least during the early centuries of the Christian era, were those which were required by the meaning of the words, and which were natural in giving proper attention to the expression of the thought of the poet.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Mar. Vict. 71, 3, K., *metrorum fere omnium natura talis est, ut caveant ne singulas partes orationis singulorum pedum fine concludant, sed potius ut verba vel nomina ex residua sui parte sequentibus pedibus adnectant, quo pacto evenit\* vocum integer pes esse, sed sane ut perfectae parti orationis de sequenti sermone aliquid accedat, nec umquam facile cum fine pedis pars orationis impleatur.*



Whether this holds true for the earlier recitation of the Homeric poems is a question which is more difficult to answer. Some of the points in the problem which this question presents have already been touched upon, and a fuller discussion of them, and of others, is impossible in this paper. They do not seem to the present writer to be of sufficient weight to justify us in believing that caesura, even if it had been recognized in the fifth century B. C., for example, and even earlier, after the poems had ceased to be sung, would have had any other significance than it had in the doctrine of the *μετρικοί*.

This conclusion, to which the writer has been led by a careful study of the sources, in spite of a preconceived notion of caesura as nothing but a pause in thought, does not prevent us from making a pause at a caesura, nor from dividing the verse into two *cola* by such a pause. But it does make the converse impossible. For if caesura is not a pause, but only a conflict between the words and the metrical feet, *we have no right to make a pause in the third or the fourth foot of the hexameter unless this pause is justified by the thought of the poet*. Still less can we mark the end of a rhythmical *colon* always (with Lehrs), or whenever a word-end occurs (Masqueray and others) after the first or second syllable of the third foot. But we must guard against the assumption that adherence to the theory of caesura as a matter of metrical conflict nullifies the value of the studies which have been made in the relation between the caesurae and Homeric language, versification, relation of thought to the parts of the verse, and the kind of words which are most frequently found or avoided before and after caesurae. The results of such studies, which are of the greatest value for the appreciation of the poet's technique, are as valid as ever. The only modification which is necessary is in the terms in which the reasons for these results are expressed.

The writer is far from claiming to have removed all the difficulties from the complicated problem which is presented by the doctrine of the Homeric caesura. But these principles seem to have been more or less clearly established by the foregoing discussion:

1. Caesura was not recognized in the classic period of Greek literature.

2. Rhythmical caesura, i. e., a pause or hold which marks the end of the first of two rhythmical or musical *cola* without regard to the sense, is not supported by evidence which is sufficient to justify us in making such a pause or hold in the oral rendering of the Homeric poems.

3. Logical caesura, or a pause in sense at certain preferred places in the verse, is not caesura at all according to the most widely accepted meaning of the term in ancient times. It was a misapplication of the term which was due to the rhetoricians.

4. Caesura belongs to the purely metrical doctrine, and does not mean a pause.

We may put the results of our study more briefly by saying that we have rejected the doctrine of the rhythmical caesura as unsupported by the evidence; that we do not call a pause in sense 'caesura,' and that caesura is merely a matter of word-ends, and does not imply a pause. This position requires further elucidation. According to it, caesura is a metrical phenomenon, and in its widest application (which the ancients did not fully recognize, because the doctrine arose from the observation that certain shorter verses were contained within the hexameter) constitutes one of the two fundamental principles of structure which distinguish recitative poetry from prose.<sup>43</sup> Both of these principles have to do with the opposition which exists in poetry between law or sameness on the one hand, and freedom or variety on the other—the eternal conflict between the one and the many, the former being represented by the metrical or the rhythmical scheme, the latter by the words of the poem. In the heroic hexameter, which, unlike melic meters, is never used together with other measures, the monotony which would result from the constant repetition of precisely the same scheme is partly avoided by the interchange of dactyls and spondees in the 32 *σχήματα*, but the underlying framework of the verse is as rigid as that of the Doric temple. Upon this frame must be arranged the words which represent the poet's thought. The simplest arrangement which immediately suggests itself, is that in which the grammatical sentence or clause exactly fills the

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Charlton A. Lewis, *The Principles of English Verse*, 1906, to which the writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness for valuable suggestions. See also Sidney Colvin, *Keats* (in *Morley's Makers of Literature*), chap. II.

verse and has no break in the thought, and the words of the sentence fill each a metrical foot. But this is impracticable because of the nature of the language and the modes of thought; it is likewise not poetry, for it lacks the important element of art, or adaptation to the underlying form. Hence arise the two principles (1) of variation from the rhythmical norm, and (2) of conflict between the words and the metrical feet. The first of these principles has nothing to do with the meter, that is, with the arrangement of the syllables in feet, but rather with the rhythm of the verse, which depends on the length of the time intervals. The rhythmical norm of the hexameter consists of six equal groups of four *χρόνοι* *πρῶτοι* each, and rhythmical variety is obtained by pauses or holds. In music these are either of definite length, which may be indicated by arbitrary signs, or else they are unmeasurable departures from the precise rhythm which are due to what is called expression or phrasing. In recitative poetry a similar variation results from making a grammatical *colon* or *comma* or still shorter phrase end at some place other than the close of the verse, and from the use of that emotional element of the spoken language which we call emphasis. This rhythmical variety is concerned with the poet's thought and with the meaning of the words, rather than with their form. But the words themselves, aside from the meaning which they convey, offer the opportunity for variety of a different kind, which is the result, as has been intimated, of a conflict between their length and position in the verse, and the six schematic feet which form the underlying framework of the hexameter. In the series between perfect agreement with this metrical scheme and absolute disagreement there are an endless number of partial agreements and partial conflicts. This principle of conflict or agreement was embraced under the broad term 'caesura' as used by Priscian, and 'τομή' of the ancient metricians whom Eustathius cites. But 'caesura' as a technical term of the great majority of ancient writers whose works have come down to us, denoted the positions in the verse, after the first two feet,<sup>44</sup> in which metrical conflict (or agreement) was most desired.

<sup>44</sup> The reason for the failure of the metricians to notice caesura in the first two feet has been indicated above (p. 365, note 37). This is of course an entirely different question from the one which concerns the

It has often been said that the perfection of art consists in a balance between two opposing principles of law and freedom, or of sameness and variety. In the Homeric verse, as we have said, the principle of sameness is represented by the underlying scheme of the single measure which is employed. The principle of variety is illustrated by the σχήματα; by the choice of very long or very short words in sequence; by the occurrence of word-ends in all possible places within the verse, with a single exception,<sup>48</sup> and, finally, by the freedom with which the thought not only at times disregards the natural place for a pause, which is at the end of the verse, but is also complete at so many points within the verse. The fixed scheme, which represents the principle of law, is never forgotten, but with the love of freedom which is native in the Ionian artist, the Homeric poet inclines a little towards the side of variety, thereby adding to the beauty of his poetry. Those who would always make a pause at the 'caesura' of the third (or fourth) foot, overlook this important characteristic of Homeric verse. Yet a comparison of Homer with the later epic poets by means of stylometric tests which have to do with the adaptation of words and thought to the metrical scheme shows that it is Homer who is the lover of freedom, and that the later poets tend to abandon somewhat the principle of variety, and to restrict the possibilities of deviation from the fixed underlying scheme. In ancient times the superiority of Homer in this respect was recognized by Hermogenes, and is put most clearly with reference to the caesurae and the pauses in sense by his commentator, Joannes Siceliotes (498, Walz). The commentator confused caesura with the pause in the sense, calling τομή now a word-end, later, a pause in the thought, and still again a pause sufficient for punctuation, but he is clear in his conclusion: καὶ διὰ οὖν τὰς διαφορὰς τομὰς ἀριστος ποιητῶν Ὅμηρος.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

poet's reason for desiring or avoiding conflict or agreement in this or in any other part of the verse.

<sup>48</sup> The 'fourth trochaic' caesura, where a word-end is found so rarely that it may be said to have been forbidden.



## II. VERBALS IN -TOR, -AX, -DUS, AND -NS.

The following paper deals with words formed on verb stems and having the termination -tor, -ax, -dus, or -ns. The material is taken from Plautus, excluding the fragments. I have tried to collect every example of every word in -tor and in -ax, and every verbal in -dus and in -ns, but not every example of every word. Of verbals in -tor I have examined 119, including 324 examples; in -trix, 28, including 59 examples; in -ax (counting *dicax* and *maledicax* as 1), 14, including 52 examples; in -dus, 27, including 110 examples; in -ns, 132, including 647 examples. The collections have been made from Lodge's Index as far as possible, and from Naudet's for the remainder of the work; every example has been checked by reference to the Goetz-Schoell text, and no readings have been admitted without its authority.<sup>1</sup>

Morphologically the four classes have in common the fact that they are formed on verb stems. Words in -tor are thought of as nouns, in -ax and -dus as adjectives, in -ns as participles; some of the latter are of course classified as nouns or adjectives. I shall not here attempt to set up a criterion of noun, adjective, or participle; but it should be borne in mind that -tor and -trix, when used on the same stem, form a declension of two terminations; that -ax and -ns words have in the singular no distinction

<sup>1</sup> Rassow, *De Plauti Substantivis*, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 26-8, enumerates 125 words in -tor, and 33 in -trix. My collection includes 129 in -tor, and 32 in -trix. Ten of the -tor nouns and 3 of the -trix nouns are formed on noun stems. In the Goetz-Schoell text I have found the following nouns not mentioned by Rassow: *advorsitor*, *clamator*, *faenerator*, *grallator*, *gubernator*, *iaculator*, *infector*, *obsidiator*, *subsentator*, *superatrix* (*Mer.* 842, reading not certain); and have been unable to find *caulator*, *circumductor*, *perforator*, *veterator*, *restitrix*. I have omitted *cicatrix* (see *G. S. text*, *Asin.* 522).

Stolz (*Hist. Lat. Gram.* I, p. 550, § 207), finds in Plautus 13 -tor words formed on noun stems. I should prefer to class *licitor*, *obsonator*, and *quadruplator* as verbals. Walde relates *licitor* to *ligo*. He discusses neither *obsonator* nor *quadruplator*, but *obsonare* is found several times in Plautus, and *quadruplari* once (*Per.* 62).

in gender, and in the plural no distinction between masculine and feminine; that -*dus* words have gender distinction throughout; that -*tor* / -*trix* words are not compared, though -*dus*, -*ns* and -*ax* words are; but in Plautus only two of the latter, *audax* and *mendax*.

Of the 28 -*trix* words, 10 are found in the corresponding -*tor* form, viz., *acceptor/trix*, *adjutor/trix*, *advorsitor/advorsatrix*, *amator/trix*, *cantor/trix*, *conjector/trix*, *dictator/trix*, *orator/trix*, *tonsor/tonstrix*, *victor/trix*.<sup>2</sup> *Ambestrix* is a sort of feminine of *pransor*, but differs in its emotional ingredient; *prae-cantrix* (Mi. 693) has some force in its prefix; *persuastrix* seems to differ from *suasor* only in gender.

<sup>2</sup>Probus, p. 1452P says: Et hoc tamen scire debemus, quod appellativa or terminata, si tracta fuerint a verbo, genus femininum trix terminant, ultor, ultrix, ulcisor, praeceptor, praeceptrix, praecipio. Auctor, si sit tractum a verbo augeo, auctrix facit; si non venit a verbo, sed significat principem quod nomen non venit a verbo, et feminino genere auctor facit, sicut Vergilius ex persona Iunonis 'auctor ego audendi,' princeps, non quae augeam; nam auctrix diceret. Sed excipitur unum, quod, quamvis non veniat a verbo, tamen feminino genere trix facit balneatrix. Nam defenstrix rationabiliter debet dici, nisi quoniam male sonat. Et nonnunquam, quamvis veniat a verbo, tamen feminino or facit. Memini, hic et haec memor. Whereupon Servius, Aen. XII 159, *auctor ego audendi*, nomina in *tor* exeuntia feminina ex se faciunt, quae (in) *trix* terminantur, si tamen a verbo veniant, ut ab eo quod est *lego* et *lector* et *lectrix* facit; *doceo*, *doctor*, *doctrix*. Si autem a verbo non venerint, communia sunt. Nam similiter et masculina et feminina in *tor* exeunt, ut *hic* et *haec* senator, *hic* et *haec* balneator. Licet Petronius usurpaverit, *balneatricem* dicens. Tale est et *hic* et *haec* auctor. Sed tunc cum ab auctoritate descendit, ut hoc loco. Cum autem venit ab eo quod est *augeo*, et *auctor* et *auctrix* facit, ut si dicas, *auctor divitiarum*, vel *auctrix patrimonii*.

The earliest use of *auctor* applied to women is Plautus, St. 129, Mi auctores ita sunt amici, ut vos hinc abducam domum. / At enim nos quarum res agitur aliter auctores sumus. The word is applied to things first in Tri. 107, Id ita esse ut credas, rem tibi auctorem dabo. *Auctrix* is post-classical. Words derived from nouns do show a difference in -*tor* / -*trix* termination in Plautus: *ianitor/trix*, *praestigator/trix*. Probus suggests an interesting question. If *defenstrix* might be used except for the sound, how far can it be inferred that words were altered on account of cacophony? Also, the fact that Servius thought of *auctor* as being derived from *auctoritas* leads to the consideration that for semantic purposes it may make no difference whether a noun is derived from a verb or vice versa: *amator* : *amare* :: *audax* ; *audere* :: *servus* : *servire* :: *comes* : *comitare*.

It is perhaps worth noting here that the -tor/-trix ending, if attached to a noun stem, will be more readily defined with some exactness than if attached to a verb stem. In amator, mercator, -tor cannot be more closely defined than as denoting a tendency on the part of the person indicated to perform, or a habit of performing, the action indicated by the verb stem. In ianitor, -tor might very well be rendered as a keeper; in virgator, as wielder. Some others are harder to define; -tor in portitor really carries the idea of a collector of dues. Lectisterniator is an interesting example in which the verbal force of the second part of the compound noun lectisternium limits the meaning of -tor. The word comes to the same thing as \*sterniator lecti.

Not many present participles of those verbs from which -tor nouns are formed can be found in Plautus. The examples which I have found are: adventor/adveniēns, amator(trix)/amans, ambestrix/edens, auditor/audiēns (in every instance used with dicto or imperio), cursor/currens, gestor/gerens, meretrix/merens, potator/potans, precator/precans, screator/screans, spectator/spectans. Cantor is found, but not canens; cantans, but not cantator; so dormitator, but not dormitans; dormiens, but not dormitor.

Preston says that 'adventor' is used by the meretrix of her customers.<sup>3</sup> There are, in fact, only three instances of adventor in Plautus: As. 359, Quomodo argento intervortam et adventorem et Sauream; Tru. 96, Nequis adventor gravior abaetat quam adveniat; ibid. 616, Si aequom facias, adventores meos non incuses. In the third example, adventor has the meaning 'customer'; in the second it is probably spoken of customers, but not necessarily; in the first it has nothing to do with a meretrix. Adveniēns seems to have nowhere this technical meaning, though advenire has. It is, however, used as a noun. With Tru. 96 cf. Ba. 538, Numquae advenienti aegritudo obiectast?; Cap. 914, Adveniēns totum deturbavit cum carne carnarium. In these examples adveniēns has practically the force of adventor in Tru. 96. Contrast with these examples Curc. 338, Aggredior hominem, saluto adveniēns; Rud. 1275,

<sup>3</sup>Studies in the Diction of the Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy, Chicago, 1916, p. 16: 'The public of the meretrix (*éraipa*), those who resorted to her regularly, is commonly referred to as her 'adventores,' 'customers,' and the verb in ordinary use is 'advenire.'

*Etiamne eam adveniēns salutem?* Here *adveniēns* has the semantic value of an independent clause: 'I go up to the man and greet him.' 'Shall I go and greet her?' The conclusion to be drawn concerning *adventor* and *adveniēns* is that *adveniēns* was more fluid than *adventor*, could cover the latter's ground and more; and that *adventor* functions as a sort of specialized *adveniēns*. The need of *adventor* could not have been strongly felt, since *Plautus* used it only three times, though he uses *adveniēns* 47 times.

'*Amator*' and '*amans*' are used without distinction. Compare *Mi.* 625, *Umbra's amantum magis quam amator, Pleusicles*; *As.* 814, *Praeripias scortum amanti et argentum obicias*; *Tru.* 46, *Si iratum scortum fortēst amatori suo*; *Asin.* 177/8, *Quae amanti parcet, eadem sibi parcet parum.* / *Quasi piscis itidemst amator lenae; nequamst nisi recens*; *Ba.* 193, *Animast amica amanti; si abest, nullus est*; *Ps.* 673, *Hic amica amanti erili filio*; *Tru.* 239, *Nam ecastor numquam satis dedit suae quisquam amicae amator*; *As.* 758, *Aut quod illa amica \*amatorem praedicet*; *Tru.* 228, *Numquam amatoris meretricem oportet causam noscere*; *Mo.* 286, *Nam amator meretricis mores sibi emit.* Lodge gives three instances in which *amicus* is used with the meaning of *amator*: *Mi.* 391, *Quom illa ausculata mea soror gemina esset suompte amicum*; *St.* 766, *Stantem stanti savium/dare amicum amicae*.<sup>4</sup> *Amatrix* occurs twice in *Plautus*: *As.* 511, *Satis dicacula's amatrix*; *Po.* 1304, *Sed adire certumst hanc amatricem Africam.* There is only one occurrence of *amata* in *Plautus*, and there clearly as a participle: *Mo.* 200, *Nilo ego quam nunc tu amata sum, atque uni modo gessi morem.* There is no instance of *amatus*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup>In Lodge's third example (*Ps.* 1263, the text is unsound, and see *Tru.* 171, *Ego fateor sed longe aliter est amicus atque amator*).

<sup>5</sup>These specimens of the erotic vocabulary of *Plautus* furnish a good example of the haphazard way in which language develops. *Amans* is used of both sexes: *Ps.* 1259, *Nam ubi amans complexust amantem*; *Ba.* 208, *Misera amans desiderat*; *As.* 591, *Quia tui amans abeuntis egeo*; *id.* 665, *ne nos diiunge amantis.* In these instances it is feminine except that one *amans* (*Ps.* 1259) and one *amantes* (*As.* 665) are masculine. In the majority of instances, however, it is masculine. When masculine it may be contrasted with feminine *amans*, *amica*, *scortum*, *meretrix*. *Amator* is always masculine, and contrasted with feminine *amica*, *scortum*, *meretrix*. I have not found *amans/meretrix*



Ambestrix is found Cas. 778, *Novi ego illas amb[as]estrices: corbitam cibi / Comesse possunt. Edens occurs Cu. 186, Irascere si te edentem hic a cibo abigat.* The difference in form between these two words is that (beside formal difference of number and case) the former has a prefix and a termination regarded as distinctively feminine. The semantic differences are that *edens* here refers to one as actually eating while *ambestrices* refers to the people as greedy; and consequently in addition the latter has an unpleasant emotional ingredient that the former lacks.

Auditor occurs only once: Ps. 429, *Si meo arbitrato liceat omnes pendeant Gestores linguis, auditores auribus.* Both auditor and audiens have specialized meanings; auditor in the foregoing passage means an 'eavesdropper'; audiens in Plautus means 'obedient.' Auditor has here an unpleasant emotional ingredient. Audiens is always part of a frozen phrase, and has the idea of carrying out the command as well as hearing it. It (*audiens*) occurs six times with *dicto*, once with *dicto imperio*, once with *imperiis*.

Seven instances of *currens* occur, three of *cursor*; two of the former and one of the latter in starred verses. In Mer. 123, *Genua hunc cursorem deserunt*, '*cursorem*' is spoken by one who has just been running, and may be compared with Mer. 598, *Sed isnest quem currentem video?* It functions much as a present perfect participle active. In Po. 545/6 *Siquid tu placide otioseque agere vis, operam damus: / Si properas cursores meliust te advocatos ducere*, the point may be 'advocates who can run,' though it probably is 'runners as advocates.'

Gestor occurs only once in Plautus, Ps. 429. It means tale-bearer. Gerens occurs Tru. 145, *Plerique idem quod tu facis faciunt rei male gerentis*, and *ibid.* 223, *Piaculumst miserere nos hominum rei male gerentum*, in each instance modified by *male* and governing a genitive.

Meretrix is a definitely specialized word, and merens never

or amator/amans contrasted. Amicus, which has a non-erotic meaning almost always, is twice used as equivalent of amator or amans. Amatrix occurs twice. Amica has a specialized, erotic meaning. Such general terms as *adulescens* and *mulier* are sometimes used in an erotic context as practically equivalent to amator or amica.

approaches it in meaning. There are eight occurrences of *merens* in Plautus, in each instance with *bene* or *male*.

*Potator* occurs once: *Men.* 259, *Voluptarii atque potatores maxumei*: / *Tum sycophantae et palpatores plurumei*. Here *-tor* in *potator* is practically the equivalent of *-arius* in *voluptarius*; in each instance the semantic content of the termination is 'addicted to.' *Potans* occurs twice: *Cu.* 124, *Nam tibi amantes, propitiantes, vinum potantes dant omnes*, *Ps.* 1270, *Illos accubantis, potantis, amantis / cum scortis reliqui*. In the first example *potantes* differs from *potator* above by the presence of *vinum*, but is felt as a noun, and is the subject of a verb; in the second it is adjectival in force.

There are two examples of *precator* and one of *precans*: *Ps.* 606, *Nam ego precator et patronus foribus processi foras*; *As.* 415, *Siquidem hercle nunc summum Iovem te dicas detinuisse / Atque is precator adsiet malam rem effugies numquam*; *Ru.* 259, *Nam vox me precantum huc foras excitavit*. In these examples *precator* is an adjunct of a pronoun, and its function is mainly adjectival; *precantum* is independent of any other substantive, and means suppliant. It might be said that the idea of action continuing is emphasized, but this explanation is unnecessary; *vox* in the context does that quite as well if *precatorum* be substituted.

There is one instance of *screator* and one of *screans*, both, according to Harpers' *Lexicon*, ἀπ. λεγ.: *Mi.* 647, *Minume sputator, screator sum, itidem minume mucidus*; *Cu.* 115, *Tibi qui screanti, siccae, semisomnae adfert potionem et sitim sedatum it*. It is difficult to see much difference between *screator* and *screanti* except in case and gender.

*Spectator* occurs twenty-six times. In twenty-two of these instances it occurs in the form *spectatores*, which is vocative in eighteen instances. Three times it is accusative, once in an address to the spectators, once in an intimation that they should be addressed: *Ca.* 1, *Salvere iubeo spectatores optumos*; *Ps.* 1332, *Quin vocas spectatores simul*? Once it occurs in what is probably a hit at the spectators: *Mer.* 160, *Dormientes spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites*? In *Poe.* 551 the nominative occurs: *Omnia istaec scimus iam nos, si hi spectatores sciant. / Horunc hi[n]c nunc causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula*.

There are two instances of the genitive beside the one just given: Tru. 109, *Fit pol hoc et pars spectatorum sci[s]tis pol haec vos me haud mentiri*; Ps. 720, *Horum causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula*. Here the first of these examples approaches the meaning of a vocative, the second does not. There is one instance of a dative: Am. Prol. 66, *Ut conquis[i]tores singula in subsellia / Eant per totam caveam spectatoribus*.<sup>6</sup> *Spectans* and *inspectans* occur once each, both in the *Amphitruo*: 151, *Adeste: erit operae pretium hic spectantibus / Iovem et Mercurium facere histrioniam*. Here *spectantibus* is a noun, and cannot mean anything different from *spectatoribus*. <In>*spectans* occurs 998, *Iam hic deludetur, spectatores, vobis <in>spectantibus*. *Spectator* is not used in a professionalized sense; anybody could be a spectator. Nor has the suffix any force of inherence or permanence. *Spectatores* are not 'qui spectent' but 'qui spectant.' Consequently the word is not different from *spectans*, except, perhaps, that it is timeless. It may be addressed to those who have seen a play, or to those who are about to see one.

The phrase 'professionalized sense' requires a word of explanation. If an action was of such a nature that it was isolated from other activities to the extent that it was performed by a special class, then the noun denoting a member of that class became a professionalized word in the sense in which I here use that term; if on the other hand the action was not so isolated and performed, there was corresponding to such action no professionalized noun. It can readily be seen that the distinction is not absolute; but *imperator* or *gubernator*, on the one hand, and *osor* or *impulsor*, on the other, will serve to illustrate the difference. It should be borne in mind that this professionalizing or non-professionalizing of a word was due to its semantic area and to the circumstances of the time. The difference between a professionalized and a non-professionalized word is the difference between the so-called subjunctive of characteristic and

<sup>6</sup>*Spectatores* is used at the conclusion of thirteen of the twenty plays in an address to the audience; the conclusion of the *Aulularia* is fragmentary; at the conclusion of the *Miles*, *Poenulus*, and *Truculentus*, 'Plaudite' occurs; of the *Epidicus*, 'Plaudite et valete'; of the *Asinaria* 'plausum datis'; of the *Mercator*, 'vos acumst clare plaudere,' addressed to the *adulescentes*, who are supposed to be the *spectatores* most interested in the outcome of the play.

the indicative; the difference between 'qui spectent' and 'qui spectant' above, with the further difference that the action denoted by the verb from which a professionalized verbal noun was formed must have been set apart for performance by a special class. This latter point of contrast makes a distinction between such -tor nouns as *imperator* and verbals in -ax. The latter may denote permanence of quality or permanent tendency to action quite as much as a -tor noun; but there are in Plautus no -ax words denoting a professional class.

There are, as noted above, fourteen verbals in -ax in Plautus; of these, three have corresponding forms in -ns; viz., *edax*, *ferax*, *maledicax*. *Per.* 421, *Perenniserve*, *lurco edax*, *furax*, *fugax*; *Ep.* 307, *agrum*. . . . / *Aeque feracem quam hic est noster Periphanes*; *Cu.* 512, <H>*au male meditate maledicaz es*. Compare *Cu.* 186, *Irascere si te edentem hic a cibo abigat*; *Mo.* 232, *Quom <me> videbunt gratiam refer<re rem fe>renti*; *Mer.* 410, *Atque ut nunc sunt maledicentes homines*.<sup>7</sup> Here *edentem* is obviously a present participle, denoting definite action at the time referred to; *edax* denotes rather tendency; *ferax* is a specialized sort of *ferens*, and would apply to only one meaning of *fero*; cf. *Lucretius*, v, 942, *Plurima tum tellus etiam maiora ferebat*. There seems to be no difference between *maledicax* and *maledicentes* in the examples quoted, except that *maledicax* exactly fulfils the function of a perfect participle active; *Cappadox* has just been abusing *Lycos*.

According to Naudet's Index, participles in -ns are, in Plautus, formed on only four of the verb stems on which -dus verbals are formed;<sup>8</sup> these participles are *cupiens*, *nitens*, *placens*, and *valens*. Further, the Goetz-Schoell text reads *nitent* for the only instance of *nitens* which Naudet gives, and *placet* or *placent* in seven of the nine instances of *placens*, while the other two are missing. So far as I can discover, there is left in the standard text of Plautus no instance of *nitens* or *placens*; there remain

<sup>7</sup> There seems to be no instance of 'dicens' in the Goetz-Schoell text, though Lodge quotes one from *Mer.* 142.

<sup>8</sup> As to the connection of -dus verbals with their verbs, see Stolz, *Hist. Lat. Gram.*, p. 564, § 223: 'Aber zuzugeben ist, dass im Sprachgefühl Bildungen wie *avidus*, *callidus*, *validus*, u. s. w. mit den entsprechenden Verben in unmittelbaren Zusammenhang gebracht wurden.'



therefore only two participles — *cupiens* and *valens* — formed upon the same stems with -*dus* verbals.

There is sometimes no difference between *validus* and *valens*. Compare *As.* 575, *Ubi saepe ad languorem tua duritia dederis octo / Validos lictores, ulmeis adfectos lentis virgis*, and *ibid.* 565, *Astutos audacis viros, valentis virgatores*. *Validus* is used of opes, *Iuppiter*, absolutely (*Tru.* 126, *valeo et validum teneo*), once or twice of a subject *homo* or *ego* in the nominative. *Valens* seems to occur only three times, *valentula* once; in each instance applied to a person, as is *validus* in every instance but one.

Examples of *cupidus* are: *Ps.* 183, *vini modo cupidae estis*; *Po.* 179, *Leno . . . auri cupidus*; *Mi.* 1215,<sup>9</sup> *Moderare animo: ne sis cupidus*; *Tri.* 237a, *Numquam amor quemquam nisi cupidum hominem / Postulat se in plagas conicere*; *Ba.* 1015, *Ego animo cupido atque oculis indomitis fui*. *Cupiens* occurs: *Ba.* 278, *Postquam aurum abstulimus in navem conscendimus / Domi cupientes*; *Mi.* 1165, *Abierim cupiens istius nuptiarum*; *ibid.* 997, *huc transivit atque huius cupiens corporist*; *Am.* 132, *Quoius cupiens maxumest*; *Po.* 74, *Cupienti liberorum, osori mulierum*. Both *cupidus* and *cupiens* take the genitive; they seem practically equivalent in semantic area; though I have not in *Plautus* found *cupiens* used absolutely as is *cupidus* in *Mi.* 1215, and the former seems more often used in an erotic context; *cupidus* is however so used in *Tri.* 237a. There is no record of the noun *cupitor* in *Plautus*' time; it occurs first in *Tacitus*,<sup>10</sup> and is there found twice: *An.* XII 7, *nec tamen*

<sup>9</sup> Compare, with *Mi.* 1215, *Cicero, Tusc.* IV 61, *Constantem enim quendam volumus, sedatum, gravem, humana omnia prementem illum esse, quem magnanimum et fortem virum dicimus. Talis autem nec maerens, nec timens, nec cupiens, nec gestiens esse quisquam potest.*

<sup>10</sup> *Tacitus* did not use *cupitor* from any objection to *cupiens* or *cupidus*. He gives two examples of *cupidus*: *D.* 31, *In his artibus exercitationibusque versatus orator, sive apud infestos, sive apud cupidos, sive apud invidentes, sive apud tristes, sive apud timentes dicendum habuerit, tenebit venas animorum*; *Hist.* I 80, *vulgus, ut mos est, cuiuscumque motus novi cupidum*. There are numerous instances of *cupiens*, usually governing the genitive, but sometimes the accusative: *Hist.* IV 49, *Festus . . . neque modica cupiens*; *An.* 16, 22, *Aut nova cupientibus auferatur dux et auctor*; *ibid.* 14, 14, *ut est vulgus, cupiens voluptatum*; *ibid.* 15, 46 (*populus*) *ut est novarum rerum cupiens pavidusque*.

repertus est nisi unus talis matrimonii cupitor; id. XV 42, Nero tamen, ut erat incredibilium cupitor. It will be seen that cupitor is here in semantic content and in construction parallel to instances of cupiens and cupidus above.

In his edition of the Eclogues and Georgics (1847) Keightley has an excursus (p. 328) apropos of Ecl. I 65, Pars Scythiam et rapidum Cretae veniemus Oaxen, the upshot of which is that rapidus is equivalent to rapax, and is active. Rapidus, from rapio, would therefore appear to be nearly equivalent to rapiens and rapax, and to signify 'carrying away' and hence 'consuming.'<sup>11</sup> Keightley continues: 'in the following excursus we will show that adjectives in -idus and -ax are properly participles of the present tense and govern a genitive case.' The latter part of this statement should be qualified, and the former extended. Almost any verbal is at times a present participle, and verbals in -dus and -ax do not necessarily govern any case, though the genitive is fairly common after them. In a second excursus (p. 330) he continues, 'here we will endeavour to extend the principle, and show that this is the real nature of the supposed nouns in -idus, and that they are actives and not passive like the greater part of the nouns derived from them in modern languages.' A more satisfactory statement of the case would be that they are active or passive or both as stem and context require. Any discussion of voice or mode of adjectives which overlooks this fact is apt to become involved in metaphysics.<sup>12</sup> Paucker, in his discussion of words in -ivus has the right idea.<sup>13</sup>

Compare cupiens and pavidus in the last example; and compare the last two examples with volgus . . . novi motus cupidum, and cupitor incredibilium above.

<sup>11</sup>In two verses of Lucretius, IV 714; V 893, quoted by Keightley, modern editors have changed the reading 'rapidi' (canes, leones) to 'rabidi,' in each instance without MS authority—hardly an application of 'difficilior lectio melior.' 'Travolgenti' is Giussani's translation of 'rapidos,' Lucr. I 15.

<sup>12</sup>For examples of grammar and metaphysics badly mixed, see F. Hansen, Die Aktivbedeutung der Adjektiva auf *bilis* im archaischen Latein, *Philologus* 47 (1889), pp. 274-290, and 'The Latin Adjective,' A. J. P. X 34-44. There are some good observations, e. g., Phil. p. 286, 'Die Adjektiva auf *bilis* sind im archaischen Latein niemals wirklich aktiv . . . sie sind vielmehr entweder passiv oder sie enthalten gewisse Mittelstufen zwischen echtem Passiv und echtem Aktiv, welche

In such an example as *Mi. 760, Probus hic conger frigidus*, is *frigidus* felt as active, or passive? In *Mer. 965, Uxor tibi placida et placatast*, it would be difficult to assign any voice to *placida*, though it stands beside *placata*. -Tus endings must originally have passed through some similar condition, as they are now in some instances (*cenatus, iuratus*) active; possibly even -tor, if one can argue from such a word as *vector*.<sup>14</sup>

There is only one verb in Plautus which forms verbals in both -ax and -tor, that is *rapere*; it forms also *rapidus*; but I have been unable to find any instance of *rapiens*. *Men. 65, Ingressus fluvium rapidum ab urbe haud longule, / Rapidus raptori pueri subduxit pedes, / Abstraxitque hominem in maxumam malam crucem*. Here *raptor* is formally a noun governing the genitive. Its function is that of a perfect participle active. The old man

ich als die intransitive, instrumentale, und causale Bedeutung bezeichnet habe.' Hanssen's perception of 'Mittelstufen' is correct, though his classification as 'intransitive, instrumentale, und causale' leads into devious ways. But compare his remarks in *A. J. P. X 42*: 'I now come to the subject of mood. In the treatment of the moods of the adjective, we have, without doubt, to lay as a foundation the renowned trinity of Kant (cf. Kant's Critic of Pure Reason, Transcendental Analysis I 2). Kant distinguishes the problematic, assertive and apodictic modality ("Possibility, Existence, Necessity"). In this trinity, thinking is coupled with necessity. It is my opinion, although the modern comparative grammar holds an entirely different view, that it must also form the basis of the mood-doctrine in the verb. But on this point one can believe as he chooses; at any rate, Kant's division applies perfectly well in the case of the adjective.

'The assertive modality, to which the indicative in the verb corresponds, is found in the majority of adjectives. This needs no proof.'

<sup>14</sup> *Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte*, p. 111: 'Die Suffixe -uus und -ivus . . . gehören in die Reihe derjenigen Suffixe, wie -us (-ul-us, -b-ul-us . . .) oder -is (-il-is, -b-ilis . . .) u. s. w., welche die schon im Participium beginnende Nominalisirung des Verbalbegriffs fortsetzend Verbal- oder Participial-Adjektiva bilden, nomina praedicativa, in welchen das Participium formell und functionell nominalisirt ist. Das ist die Function dieser Suffixe, eine Bedeutung haben sie an sich nicht.'

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28: 'Das Verbalnomen auf t-or, s-or, weiblich -rix, das wir persönliches Participialnomen benennen möchten, bezeichnet den persönlichen Träger einer Bethätigung als solchen, wie *amator* = is qui amat, Liebhaber, *imperator* = is qui imperat, imperandi potestatem habet, hat also eine activische Bedeutung actionis imperfectae, nur selten ausnahmsweise eine passivische als *vector* auch is qui vehitur, Seefahrer, Reiter, gestator *Mart. is qui gestari se patitur*.'

had once carried off a boy. There is no idea of permanent characteristic. It is different in Ep. 300, *Auro opulentus, miles Rhodius, raptor hostium*; a proper epithet for a soldier, and denoting characteristic.

As to the participial character of *raptor*, see Am. 206, *Si sine vi et sine bello velint rapta et raptore tradere*. *Raptore* is active to *rapta* passive. Tri. 254, *Raptore panis et peni*, gives the idea of characteristic again. Compare with the last example Tri. 285, *Turbant, miscent mores mali, rapax, avarus, invidus*. *Rapax* is not limited by an object in the genitive; that is its only semantic difference from *raptor*. Note also that in the last example *rapere: rapax:: avere: avarus:: invidere: invidus*; that is, here *-ax = -rus = -dus*.

For the coincidence of *-tor* and *-dus* on the same stem in Plautus, *rapere* furnishes also the only example; and beside the verses quoted above (Men. 65-8) there is only one occurrence of *rapidus*: Ba. 85, *Rapidus fluvius est hic; non hac temere transiri potest*.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore *rapidus* and *rapax* furnish the only coincidence of an *-ax* and a *-dus* verbal on the same stem.

<sup>15</sup> As *rapidus* occurs in Plautus in every instance with *fluvius*, it may be well to cite some passages quoted by Keightley: "Ennius says (A. 302) '*Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda*,' which verse Lucretius thus imitates (I 721) '*Angustoque fretu rapidum mare dividit undis*.' This poet also, having said (I 15) '*Et rapidos tranant amnes*,' has only two (Munro's text, three) lines after, '*fluviosque rapaces*,' evidently for the sake of varying the phrase." On the last passage Munro says: '*rapacis* is well explained by Ovid Met. VIII 550 *nec te committe rapacibus undis: Ferre trabes solidas obliquaque volvere magno Murmure saxa solent. vidi contermina ripae Cum gregibus stabula alta trahi*: Vergil also applies it to rivers, Seneca to a torrent, Ennius(?) Ann. 303, Ovid, Seneca to a sea-current.' (Compare also Seneca, Thy. 477, *Siculi rapax . . . aestus unda*.) Munro's example from Ovid seems to me not apposite to the passage from Lucretius; that is, if he intends by the two examples to set up a concept peculiar to *rapax*. The passages from Lucretius give no comment on either *rapidus* or *rapax*, while the Ovid passage does comment on *rapax*; which comment, if there were nothing else to compare it with, might lead to the establishment of an artificial difference between *rapidus* and *rapax*. But Ovid (also quoted by Keightley) uses the former in the sense that Munro here rightly illustrates (though unfairly applies) for *rapax*: Tr. I 7, 20, *Imposui rapidis viscera nostra rogis*. See also Giusani on Lucr. I 15, quoted above. The truth probably is that the idea of swiftness and the idea of consuming were not clearly differentiated



The total number of -tor/trix verbals from Plautus examined (counting as one amator/trix, etc., where the masculine and feminine terminations are found on the same stem) is 137; of -ax verbals, 14; -dus, 27; -ns, 132. It should be observed that no single instance occurs of all four terminations on the same stem; of three terminations occurring on one stem the only example is furnished by the verbals of rapere; this verb furnishes also the only instances of -ax/-dus, -tor/-dus, -tor/-ax. Of the combination -ns/-dus the only examples are furnished by valens/validus and cupiens/cupidus; the -ns/-ax combination is found on the stems of only three verbs, maledicere, edere, ferre; -tor/-ns on those of eleven: advenire, amare, audire, currere, edere, gerere, merere, potare, precari, creare, spectare. Therefore out of a possible 14 coincidences of the four terminations, not one occurs; of a possible 69 occurrences of three of the terminations on one stem, one occurs; of a possible 14 occurrences of -ax/-tor or -ax/-dus, one of each is found; of a possible 27 coincidences of -ns/-dus, two occur; of a possible 14 of -ax/-ns, three occur; of a possible 27 of -tor/-dus, one occurs; and of a possible 132 of -ns/-tor, -trix eleven occur. Furthermore, instances occur, as noted above, where two terminations with equivalence of semantic content are found on the same stem. The conclusion may be fairly drawn that when one of these terminations was in use already upon any given stem, it was more apt to continue to be used than to give place to another. The participial termination was the least differentiated of them all, having only two restrictions, that of time and that of voice, the former of which was not always observed. This termination is also, as might be expected, the one furnishing the largest number of examples (in my collection of -ns verbals, which, as observed above, is not complete, 647 as compared with 383 of -tor/-trix verbals, the collection of which I have tried to make complete). It could cover, in suitable context, about all the ground that they could cover; but they could perform most of the functions of an active present participle even to the extent, in the case of auctor, of governing an accusative. The fact that there are so few coin-

in either of these words. We think of the words 'rapid' and 'rapacious,' semantically distinct in English, and are then apt unconsciously to read back some such distinction into rapax and rapidus.

cidences of pairs of the terminations -tor, -ax, -dus, -ns, upon the same stem is significant. Taken in conjunction with the fact that when they do so occur they have sometimes no appreciable semantic difference, it would seem that they composed in Plautus a mass of more or less undifferentiated material. The remainder of this paper aims to illustrate this condition in more detail.

The termination -ns is not, of course, strictly limited to verb-stems. See Stolz, *Hist. Lat. Gram.*, pp. 423, 562, §§ 62, 221. Stolz says, § 221, 'an die Participia auf -nt- hat sich eine beträchtliche Anzahl gleichgearteter Bildungen angeschlossen die von Substantiven abgeleitet sind'; but he refers to them as 'zum grossen Theil erst der späteren Latinität angehörige Bildungen.' Such formations are not of interest here, except as showing that -ns was capable of a wide application.

Lindsay (L.L., p. 352) quotes as nouns *parens*, *serpens*, *adollescens*, and others. His remark on *rudens*<sup>16</sup> is "rudens (O. Ind. rudant), (1) 'roaring,' (2) 'a rope.'" Neither *serpens* nor *serpere* is found in Plautus (on Naudet's evidence). *Proserpens* occurs four times (As. 695, Per. 299, Poe. 1034, St. 724), each time with *bestia*; that is, as an adjective. All of the words here given retain the present force except *parens*,<sup>17</sup> which may be presumed to have had it at first, though it could hardly be applied until after the event; and it was applied to people as long as they lived, thus having the character rather of a perfect than of a present participle. Cf. Poe. 110, *Quo genere gnata, qui parentes fuerint*, where *parentes* could be regarded as a present participle, and Ru. 390, *Qui suos parentes noscere posset*, where it could not.

The participle may be a noun or an adjective. It may also function as a future or as a past tense. Following are some examples of *adveniens* to illustrate this point. St. 456, *Nunc interviso iamne a portu advenerit / Ut eum advenientem meis dictis deleniam*; here *adveniens* amounts to 'if he has come.' Compare Per. 731, *Transcidi loris omnis adveniens domi*, and Poe. 1137, *Tua pietas nobis plane auxilio fuit / Quum huc advenisti hodie in ipso tempore*. The tense idea is the same in *advenisti* and in *adveniens*; see also Cap. 914, *Adveniens totum detur-*

<sup>16</sup> Walde says of *rudens* 'vielleicht . . . Ptc. eines d- Präsens . . . Kaum als rasselnd oder dgl. zu *rudo*.'

<sup>17</sup> On the formation of *parens* see Lindsay, L. L. p. 465.

bavit cum carne carnarium / Arripuit gladium, praetruncavit tribus tergoribus glandia. Adveniens here cannot denote incompleted action. So in Ps. 1201, Ego tibi argentum dedi / Et dudum adveniens extemplo sumbolum servo tuo. In these examples adveniens is equivalent to a past tense.

Examples in which 'adveniens' is equivalent to a future tense are easy to find. Ba. 61, Tu prohibebis et eadem opera tuo sodali operam dabis / Et ille adveniens tuam med esse amicam suspicabitur; 'when he shall come' or, colloquially, 'when he comes.' Compare Am. 466, Iam ille illuc ad erum quom Amphitruonem advenerit / Narrabit servom hinc sese a foribus Sosiam / Amovisse. Compare Mi. 578, Ut miles quom extemplo a foro adveniat domum / Domi comprehendar, and Ba. 769, Ambulabo ad [h]ostium, ut, quando exeat / Extemplo advenienti ei tabelladem in manum. Compare also Mo. 1069, Docte atque astu[te] mihi captandumst cum illo ubi huc advenerit, and Cu. 660, Tu ut hodie adveniens cenam des sororiam; and with the last example compare Mi. 806, Miles domum ubi advenerit / Memineris ne Philocomasium nomines.

These examples are intended to illustrate the point that the verbal in -ns is not limited in its time function to the present or to continuous action; it was probably timeless at first, and it may in Plautus fulfil the function of a perfect, future, or future perfect tense. Its use as an adjective or a noun is too common to require further comment here.

It may be observed, however, that the verbal in -ns is sometimes treated more as an integral part of the verb than other forms which have an equal right. For instance, sapere and augere are both used transitively in Plautus: Ps. 495, recte ego meam rem sapio, Callipho, and Ep. 192, Di hercle omnes me adiuvant, augent, amant. Sapiens is never found governing an accusative; two or three times as an adjective, as Tru. 868, Cogitato mus pusillus quam sit sapiens bestia; auctor, on the other hand, is several times used with parts of the verb sum to govern an accusative; as, Ps. 1166, Quid nunc mihi's auctor, Simo? Sapiens is, of course, often used as a noun, e. g., Tri. 363, Nam sapiens quidem pol ipsus fingit fortunam sibi, as sometimes is auctor, e. g., Ep. 357, Nunc auctorem / Dedit mihi ad hanc rem Apocidem; but auctor is generally in Plautus used in combination with esse, and with distinct verbal force; yet sapiens is

found in Lewis and Short under *sapere*, and *auctor* has a section to itself, as though it had less close connection with its verb than *sapiens* has with *sapere*.

Other participles which are perhaps not often thought of as nouns, may be so used that they become nouns. Cas. 20, *Sed tamen absentes prosunt <pro> praesentibus?*; Ep. 112, *Nil agit qui diffidentem verbis solatur suis*; Am. 311, *Proin tu istam cenam largire, si sapis, esurientibus*. Ps. 1270 is an instance in which several participles appear in their immediate context to be nouns, but are found on closer examination in a wider context to be adjectives: '*Illos accubantis, potantis, amantis / Cum scortis reliqui.*'

*Adolescens* is an adjective in Ps. 434, *Quid novum adolescens homo si amat?* *Praesens* furnishes an example of a present participle in form, which is divorced in meaning from its verb because of the specialization in meaning of the latter: Poe. 88 sq., *Vendit . . . / Praesenti argento homini, si lenost homo*. In this connection notice the conjunction of *praesens* with *adesse*: Am. 977, *tametsi praesens non ades*; Mo. 1075, *adsum praesens praesenti tibi*; St. 577, *praesens esuriens adest*.

-*Tor/trix* verbals are sometimes used as adjectives or participles. Compare Mo. 916, *Me suasore atque impulsore id factum audacter dicito* and Tri. 167, *Me absente et insciente, inconsultu meo*; <sup>18</sup> also Cu. 665, *Me lubente feceris* and St. 602, *Non me quidem faciet auctore*. In Men. 444, *Dicto me emit audientem haud imperatorem sibi*, '*dicto audientem*' is contrasted with *imperatorum*. In Poe. 74, *Vendit eum domino hic quidam diviti seni / Cupienti liberorum, osori mulierum*, it should be borne in mind that *cupiens* had in Plautus' time no corresponding form *cupitor*; and that *odi* functions as a present tense; so that the conjunction of the forms here given is almost a logical necessity. As. 856-9 gives an excellent example in which *osorem* and *amantem* are directly contrasted, each limiting *virum*, and

<sup>18</sup> This is the only example of *inconsultus* recognized as a noun by Lewis and Short. It might be said that *meo* was felt as a pronoun and *inconsultu* as a participle; at any rate the pronominal force is strong in *meo* and the verbal in *inconsultu*. The construction results from the combination of the passive voice in the same sequence and construction with the active. The absence of a present passive participle is responsible for the difficulty.



in a sequence with several other adjectives: ART. At scelestā ego praeter alios meum virum †frugi rata / Siccum, frugi, continentem, amantem uxoris maxime. / PA. At nunc dehinc scito illum ante omnes minumi mortalem preti, / Madidum, nili, incontinentem atque osorem uxoris suae.

There seems to be agreement among etymologists that -turus of the future participle active has no relation to -tor.<sup>19</sup> The -tor verbal could, however, serve as a future participle active, though rarely. Compare Ps. 907, (Di) quom te genuerunt adiutorem mihi and Cu. 325, Quae tibi sunt parata, postquam scimus venturum. Adjutor, in the former example, seems to have also the idea of purpose.

In Mer. 741, Nam mihi amatori seni / coquendast cena; St. 746, Nimioque sibi mulier meretrix repperit odium ocus; and Tri. 226, Magister mihi exercitor animus nunc est, amatori, meretrix, and exercitor appear as adjectives to seni, mulier, and animus, respectively.<sup>20</sup> In Am. 188, Victores victis hostibus legiones reueniunt domum, victores in the active corresponds to victis in the passive. Victrix<sup>21</sup> occurs Cas. 820, and the -tor termination is sometimes used with a feminine noun (St. 129). The reason for victores here may very well be that it was thought of as applying to 'milites' implicit in 'legiones.' In Poe. 1094, Ei duae puellae sunt, meretrices servolae / Sorores, it may be difficult to determine whether meretrices is an adjective or a noun. So in Men. 128, Ubi sunt amatores mariti?, though in the latter passage the emphasis requires rather 'flirting husbands' than 'married flirts.'

<sup>19</sup> Lindsay, L. L., p. 540, 'the Fut. Part. Act. in -turus is probably a formation with the suffix -ro- from a TU-stem Verbal Noun.' Brugmann, V. G. II, p. 1268, note.

<sup>20</sup> Judging by their punctuation, the editors of the Goetz-Schoell text have not taken amatori seni or mulier meretrix as cases of apposition.

<sup>21</sup> Victrix as an adjective is not found in Plautus, but is rather common later: Hor. Odes, III 3, 63, Ducente victrices catervas / Coniuge me Iovis et sorore; Lucan, Phar. I 128, Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni (note contrast of victrix and victa). Also in prose: Cic. ad Att. V 21, 2, Quo autem die Cassi litterae victrices in senatu recitatae sunt; Pliny, N. H. XXXVIII 4, 15, (Adamantis) ignium victrix natura, et numquam incalescens. Prudentius, Psych. 433 has an interesting example of a -trix adjective: Caede ducis dispersa fugit trepidante pavore / Nugatrix acies. Compare the colloquial 'trifling.'

An example of a -trix word on a noun stem and adjectival in force is *ianitrix* in Cu. 76, *Anus hic solet cubare, custos ianitrix*.<sup>22</sup>

Mo. 257, *Nunc adsentatrix scelestast, dudum advorsatrix erat*, shows a strong verbal force in the words *adsentatrix* and *advorsatrix*.<sup>23</sup> The sentence might be translated, 'Now the wretch flatters, a moment ago she was opposing.' But the -tor verbal shows its verbal force most clearly in *auctor*. Following are some examples in which *auctor* with some part of the verb *sum* governs an accusative or an object clause: Mi. 1094, *Quid nunc mihi[t] auctor ut faciam, Palaestrio?*; Mer. 312, *Lysimache, auctor sum ut me amando enices*; Ps. 1166, *Quid nunc mihi's auctor Simo?*; St. 128/9, *Mi auctores ita sunt amici ut vos hinc abducam domum. / At enim nos quarum res agitur aliter*<sup>24</sup> *auctores sumus*.

Latin lacks a perfect active participle for active verbs. Sometimes the -tus participle has an active meaning.<sup>25</sup> How in other cases the idea which is in other languages expressed by a perfect or aorist participle may be expressed in Latin would be a question for a separate study; probably the best recognized methods are the ablative absolute and the cum clause. The -tor verbal, which is often a timeless participle, sometimes discharged this function. Some of the examples already quoted show the contrasting of -tor and -tus as active and passive: Am. 206, *Si sine vi . . . velint rapta et raptores tradere*; *ibid.* 188, *Victores victis hostibus legiones reveniunt domum*. Some show the -tor verbal carrying the force of a perfect participle active, as Men. 65, *Rapidus raptori pueri subduxit pedes*. So in some of the instances where *auctor esse* governs an accusative or an object clause. Compare in St. 128, *Mi auctores ita sunt amici ut vos*

<sup>22</sup> With *janitor/trix* compare the gloss of Festus, D. S. V. p. 102 M., '*ianeus* : *ianitor*,' giving an instance of semantic equivalence between -tor and -eus.

<sup>23</sup> In Plautus no present participle is found from the same stem as *adsentatrix* and *advorsatrix*.

<sup>24</sup> Note the use of *aliter* with *auctores sumus*.

<sup>25</sup> See Lindsay, L. L., p. 520 and pp. 541/2; and Stolz, *Hist. Lat. Gram.* p. 530, § 186. -Tor and -tus are sometimes semantic equivalents when formed on noun stems; compare Ru. 805, *Ehem, optume edepol eccum clavator advenit* and Cu. 424, *Clypeatus elephantum ubi machaera dissicit*.

hinc abducam domum; Mi. 1276, Egon ad illam eam quae nupta sit?; and ibid. 1374, Ante hoc factum hunc sum arbitratus semper servom pessumum; auctores, nupta, and arbitratus. There is no question about arbitratus sum; it is simply the perfect active of a deponent verb. The sense of auctores sunt is that of the perfect active of an active verb: 'My friends have been advising me to take you home out of this.' Nupta may be regarded as a participle or as a noun, according to the emphasis. Many other examples like these could be collected. If -tor is timeless so also quite often is -tus.<sup>20</sup> -Tor verbals could function as present or perfect—rarely perhaps as future—participles.

Piscator and piscatus show the contrast of active and passive between -tor and -tus. The former means 'a fisherman'; the latter 'the act of fishing' or 'the fish caught.' In Ru. 910, Gripus, after getting the box, says quae in mari fluctuoso / Piscatu novo (a new kind of fish) me uberi compotivit. Other examples of piscatus are: Ru. 912, Miroque modo atque incredibili hic piscatus mihi lepide evenit; Mo. 730, Vino et victu, piscatu probo electili / Vitam colitis; Ru. 299, 'Postid piscatum hamatilem et saxatilem adgredimur' (in the chorus of the piscatores). Compare almost any instance of piscator; e. g., Ru. 987, Sed tu nunquam piscatorem vidisti, venefice, / Vidulum piscem cepisse. Here the 'vidulum piscem' is the 'novo piscatu' referred to by Gripus in 910.

-Tor verbals are used with adjectives and nouns of every formation in a common sequence and applying to the same person or thing; in such a situation the words are of the same semantic nature, whatever they may be called. In Tri. 239a,b, blandiloquentulus, harpago, mendax, / cuppes, avarus, elegans, despoli-

<sup>20</sup>In this connection, see such examples as Am. 186, quod numquam opinatus fui, and Mo. 994, Vectus fui. Blase says (*Hist. Lat. Gram.*, Dritter Band, Erstes Heft, p. 173), 'Da das Perfektum des Passivi seine alte präsentische Bedeutung beibehielt, so war es in der Erzählung vergangener Ereignisse, weil das Partizip auch adjektivisch verstanden werden konnte, nicht deutlich genug. Man verband es deshalb zur besseren Hervorhebung der Vergangenheit mit fui. Schon im Altlatein werden einzelne solcher Perfekta ohne erkennbaren Unterschied von der Umschreibung mit est gebraucht.'

Morris says (note to Ps. 171, p. 120), 'The choice between fui and sum was influenced by the metre, as fui occurs most frequently at the end of a vs. or before the caesura of iamb. octon.'

ator, -ax = -tor = -rus. In *Mi.* 1055, *Exprome benignum ex te ingenium, urbicafe, occisor regum, 'urbicafe' = 'captor urbium.'* \**Regicidus*, so far as I know, does not exist; one cannot see why *Plautus* should have balked at such a compound. -*Tor* verbals, then, can govern an accusative, and can function as participles and as adjectives; and -*tor* can be the semantic equivalent, in suitable context, of various other terminations.

Verbals in -ax are much more frequently used (in proportion to their occurrence) to qualify nouns than are those in -tor; but the former also are not at all uncommonly used as nouns. *Men.* 1050, *Men . . . convenisse te, audax, audes dicere / Postquam advorsum mihi imperavi ut huc venires?*; *Ru.* 711, *At etiam minitatur audax?* Compare *Am.* 285, *Ego pol te istis tuis pro dictis et malefactis, furcifer*; *ibid.* 557, *iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam / Scelestam, scelus, linguam abscidam*; and *Men.* 1015, *Vos scelesti, vos rapaces, vos praedones.* *Audax* in *Men.* 1050 and *Ru.* 711 is as much or as little a noun as *furcifer* in *Am.* 285 or *scelus* *ibid.* 577. So in *Men.* 1015, *rapaces* is whatever *scelesti* and *praedones* are. In the latter sentence the idea is not to be expressed by 'you are scoundrels, etc.,' but by 'you scoundrels, etc.'

The tendency to look upon *rapax* as an adjective in such contexts is perhaps increased by the fact that for *scelus* and *furcifer* it is easy to find a convenient noun such as 'scoundrel' or 'rascal,' but no such noun so readily appears for *rapax*. In *Poe.* 1385/6, *Leno, rapacem te esse semper credidi / Verum etiam furacem <aiunt> qui norunt magis*, the second verse would most naturally be translated, 'But those who know you better say that you are also a thief.' We are not justified in calling *furax* a noun merely because it is more easily and neatly translated as such; nor in assuming that *rapax* is not a noun because it is not conveniently so translated.

The use of -ax verbals as participles has been remarked above. See also *Am.* 152, *Qui me alter est audacior homo, aut qui confidentior?* Here *confidens*: *confidere*:: *audax*: *audere*. There is no instance of *audens* in *Plautus*.

-*Dus* verbals also are sometimes nouns: *Am.* 526, *Facitne ut dixi? timidam palpo percutit*; *Au.* 485/6, *In maxumam illuc populi partemst optimum, / In pauciores avidos altercatiost*; *Ru.* 1237-9, *Atque edepol in eas plerumque esca imponitur /*



Quam siquis avidus poscit escam avariter / Decipitur in tra(n)-senna avaritia sua. In the last example note the correspondence of avidus with avaritia and avariter. In Ep. 583, (patrem) Tuom vocas me et oscularis, quid stas stupida, quid taces? and Mi. 1254, Quid astitisti obstupida?, stupida and obstupida have the force of participles, but they might be construed as adjectives or nouns, and would probably be translated into English as nouns or adverbs.

Verbals in -dus have already been mentioned as participles. Cupidus has almost always in Plautus participial force and a dependent genitive. There are other instances where the verbal force of the -dus verbal is equivalent to that of the present participle in -ns: Cu. 511, Quasi aquam ferventem frigidam esse (there is in Plautus no example of frigens nor of fervidus, though frigere and fervere occur); Ru. 409, Timidas, egenteis, uvidas, eiectas, exanimatas (there is no timens nor uvens in Plautus, and no \*egidus in Latin; though there is no logical reason why it should not exist as well as cupidus).

Verbals in -ax and -dus, when they govern any case of a noun, govern usually a genitive (see Keightley's *Excursus*, quoted above). One -tor verbal—auctor—has already been seen in combination with esse to govern an accusative; we have no such irrefragable evidence that a -dus verbal can govern an accusative, but Cas. 632, Quid timida's?, furnishes a pretty close analogy to Quid auctor es? of Ps. 1166. Timens is not found in Plautus, and timidus has just been seen (Ru. 409) in the same construction with egens. -Tor, -ax, -dus, and -ns verbals are all, in Plautus, floating between participle and noun and adjective.

Other verbals might have been included in this survey; in particular, -vus.<sup>27</sup> For example, there are in Plautus nine occurrences of fugitivus, one each of fugitor and fugax, and none of fugiens, whilst \*fugidus is not found in Latin. The only difference in the semantic content of fugax and almost any example of fugitivus, is that fugax seems less definite; and it is quite possibly brought in for alliterative effect (Per. 421, edax, furax, fugax). Before bringing this paper to a close, however, I will

<sup>27</sup> See Paucker, *Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte*, pp. 111 ff.

merely mention the terminations -*turus* and -*ndus*. Brugmann<sup>28</sup> will not allow the -*tura* nouns to be connected with the future participle active; even so, however, in such phrases as *morituri te salutant* the future participle is turning into a noun on its own account. The verbal in -*ndus* could on occasion become a noun; as in *merenda* (Mo. 966, *Vide sis ne forte ad merendam quopiam devorteris*), *praebenda*, *secundae* (Cels. VII 29; Sen. Ep. 92, 34; Pliny, N. H. XXVII 4, 13, *ibid.*, XXX 123).

*Auctor* is the verbal, ordinarily recognized as a noun, which most clearly of the -*tor* verbals examined, shows strong verbal force. It is, I believe, never found in Plautus without such force rather clearly shown. Compare with any of those instances in which *auctor esse* governs an accusative or an object clause Cic. Opt. Gen. Or. 6, 17: *Quin ipsum Isocratem, quem divinus auctor Plato suum fere aequalem admirabiliter in Phaedro laudari fecit ab Socrate*. Here *auctor* stands as a sort of finished product, an unquestionable noun. But give *auctor* a dependent genitive, as in Cic. Brutus, 11, 44, *quem rerum Romanarum auctorem laudare possum religiosissimum*, and it is not hard to pass to *consili publici auctorem* of De Orat. I 48, 211; thence it is an easy transition to Verr. II, V 26, 67, *Unum cedo auctorem tui facti*; thence to Att. IX 10 *Ego quidem tibi non sum auctor, si Pompeius Italiam relinquit, te quoque profugere*; thence to *ibid.* XV 5 *mihi que ut absim, vehementer auctor est*, where *auctor est* has the force of a perfect active verb; from which to ad Fam. VI 8, 2, *litterae a te mihi redditae sunt, quibus a me consilium petis, quid sim tibi auctor*, and Att. XIII 40, 2, *Etsi quid mi auctor es?* it is but a step.

I have indicated the process in inverse order; but the possible steps in the psychological process that must have taken place are thereby not less clearly seen. There is nothing definite here shown as to the historical character of the transition from *auctor*, the indefinite verbal, to *auctor*, the finished noun, as all these usages of the word quoted in the preceding paragraph occur in a single author; but that some such transition did take place at

<sup>28</sup> Verg. Gram., II, p. 1268, Anm.: 'Von den Verbaladjectiva auf -*turus* sind die Abstracta auf *tura* wie *partura* etymologisch zu trennen, wie sie auch in ihrer Bedeutung, die nichts futurisches hat, abweichen: sie enthielten -*rā*- als Secundärsuffix.

a definite historical time is surely a justifiable inference. After the -tor verbal was frequently recognized as a noun, -tor nouns were undoubtedly formed on verb stems without any intermediate process; the need of such nouns and the action of analogy quite easily account for that.

There is perhaps no logical reason why -ax, -dus, or -ns verbals should not have formed 'agent' nouns, and why -tor verbals should not have remained, as -ax, -dus, and -ns verbals did, rather indefinite, participial words. What differentiation took place depended on factors that cannot now be at all fully known.

The four classes studied in this paper, however, afford indication as to what must have been the earlier condition of the language. If verbals in -tor, -dus, -ax, and -ns could, in Plautus' time, be participles, adjectives, or nouns, it seems reasonable to suppose that in earlier times the variation was considerably wider. Of these and other terminations used to form verbals it seems probable that, as Paucker says of -us, -ivus, etc., 'Eine Bedeutung haben sie an sich nicht.' It is impossible, on formal grounds, to establish a hard and fast distinction between adjective, and noun and participle; in the case of verbals, it is perhaps not less impossible to make such a distinction on functional grounds. Functional distinctions, pressed to their logical conclusion, lead to metaphysics. Concerning the terminations discussed here, it can be said only that they have much ground in common, and tend to differentiation in their usage. Within each class individual words (as *cliens*, *sapiens*) may differentiate in ways which can scarcely be taken account of in any attempt at more definite generalization about the mass. On the whole, -ns words are least clearly, and -tor words most clearly, differentiated; which, in psychological terms, means, in this case, only that most -tor words, owing to their sphere of usage, will, when heard or seen without context, recall the percept of a person, while most -ns words will suggest their appropriate verbs. In this respect -dus and -ax words fall between the other two.

EDWARD W. NICHOLS.

### III. CICERO AND THE POETAE NOVI.

In the year in which Cicero reached the height of his great fame and power, honored by the people of Rome as the father of his country and a second Romulus, a number of clever young men then about the age of twenty threw aside their school-books to enter into the political fray, some with the Tories of the Senate, others choosing the alluring program of Catiline which promised quicker returns for efforts. Cicero knew many of them; not a few had been his pupils<sup>1</sup> and hence he speaks with such deep concern of the adherence or defection of the *adulescentuli*.<sup>2</sup> It was out of this circle that there arose in the following decade various noteworthy groups, one of which Cicero later called the *poetae novi*, another which he designated as Atticists, and a third, the circle of "iuvenes" who supported him most loyally in his misfortunes during the Clodian days. I wish here to notice Cicero's points of contact with these various groups and to define to what extent the same individuals entered into all of them. In the process we may find a new meaning in certain lines of Catullus and Cicero.

Just one year after the famous Nones of December a petty incident occurred which was destined to bring Cicero to grief. Clodius, always prone to mischief, scandalized Roman society by secreting himself in Caesar's house while the matrons were performing the mysterious rites of Bona Dea. The incident might have been treated as a farce and the culprit appropriately snubbed by decent society, but the Claudian family with its numerous relationships in the senatorial aristocracy was deep in politics, had made numerous enemies, and a trial for sacrilege was demanded and granted. Cicero somewhat reluctantly consented to give testimony, and so destroyed the culprit's alibi. Clodius revenged himself by a ready jibe at the witness, who retorted with a better one, and a war to the hilt was on between them before the trial was concluded.

<sup>1</sup> *Studio dicendi conciliatos plurimos adulescentulos.* De Pet. Cons. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cic. Cat. II 8 and 22; Pro Mur. 49 and 74.



At the trial Clodius was defended by the elder Curio, who was generally a good friend of Cicero's, and supported by the *iuvenes barbatuli*—the fashion had just come in—who were boisterously led by the younger Curio or *filiola Curionis*<sup>3</sup> as Cicero here calls him. These young men Cicero at this point designated by various unpleasant names, the *comissatores conjurationis*, for instance, hinting that some of them had sympathized with Catiline at least over the cups.<sup>4</sup> Indeed many of Cicero's later supporters had in their youth found Catiline attractive, as Cicero subsequently admits.<sup>5</sup>

Clodius' sister, the Lesbia of Catullus, was of course intensely interested in the whole matter, and Cicero when once stirred to the point of invective made the charge—all too freely made in those days—that bribes were offered to the jurors, this time not only in money but also by way of notes of introduction to "certain women."<sup>6</sup> One wonders with what feelings the young poet from the provinces heard the taunts hurled at Clodius and his sister during these days, the *rumores senum severiorum*, and how long it was before he wrote *Miser Catulle desinas ineptire*.

The person whom Cicero accuses of having distributed the bribes he calls *Calvus ex Nanneianis*<sup>7</sup> adding *illum laudatorem meum de cuius oratione erga me honorifica ad te scripseram*. Since Crassus had praised Cicero in the senate some five months before (Att. I 14, 2) he is usually assumed to be the man in question. However, several of Cicero's letters of this period have been lost and we cannot be certain therefore to whose speech he is referring, and the hypothesis that it was Crassus fails to explain the riddle of the peculiar name.<sup>8</sup> If Calvus is, as it seems to be, a proper name, there would be no more plausible person than the young Licinius Calvus, the boon companion of Clodia's lover Catullus, and a friend of the Curio who was mustering these young men to Clodius' support. In that case *ex nannianis* is equivalent to *ex barbatulis*, for *barbatus* (a kind of

<sup>3</sup> Ad Att. I 14, 5 and I 16, 11.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cic. Cat. II 22.

<sup>5</sup> Pro Caelio 10.

<sup>6</sup> Ad Att. I 16, 5. Cf. II 1, 5. The reference seems to be to Clodia.

<sup>7</sup> Ad Att. I 16, 5.

<sup>8</sup> See note in Tyrrell and Purser for various hypotheses.

container, Varro, L. L. V 119) is the same as *vávros* or *vávros*.<sup>9</sup> If this be indeed Catullus' friend we may well believe that he and Curio and the other *iuvenes* were in this case acting in the services of Clodia, that it was at her behest that Calvus had flattered Cicero in order to entice him from the opposition, that indeed she was now as two years later directing the battle and "sounding the advance"<sup>10</sup> for her brother. Cicero's description in the Pro Caelio of her one-time power over her hirsute devotees<sup>11</sup> will help to explain the happenings of these days. Indeed if the youngsters entered the scrimmage at Clodia's request for the sake of the lark we can understand why they so readily deserted Clodius later to become Cicero's loyal and abiding supporters.<sup>12</sup>

Before proceeding further it is necessary to examine the recurrent statement that Calvus was from his youth Cicero's enemy because of the latter's part in the trial of his father, Licinius

<sup>9</sup> Cicero in his pun may have enjoyed an implied reference to the bibulous propensities of the *comissatores*, not to mention other implications in the word *vávros*.

<sup>10</sup> De lituis *βούκιδος*, Ad Att. II 12, 2.

<sup>11</sup> Pro Caelio 33: *hac barbula* qua ista delectatur, also 48-50.

<sup>12</sup> Who the other *barbatuli* were that supported Curio and Clodius we are not told, but we may hazard the names of Caelius and Mark Antony as probably two of the *comissatores conjugationis*, since these two were early friends of Clodius and Curio besides being regarded as one-time partisans of Catiline. Antony's stepfather, Lentulus, was Catiline's chief supporter, and was put to death when the young man was about twenty. For some time Antony was also Curio's companion in his revels, and the two accumulated such debts that Cicero was called in to bring about a reconciliation between the elder Curio and the two prodigals (Phil. II 45). However, he soon disappears from our story, for after a brief season of subservience to Clodius, he saw his mistake and departed for the East. Thence he returned in 54 to enter Cæsar's services in Gaul. He was at that time Cicero's friend.

Caelius who seems to have been a trifle older than Antony had studied with Cicero, but in 63 had fallen under Catiline's influence like *multi boni adulescentes*, as Cicero later remarked (Pro Caelio 10). In 62 he entered the staff of the African proconsul but may well have returned before the trial in April 61. We know that he was soon one of Catullus' best friends and that—presumably in 59—the handsome fellow became the poet's rival for the favors of Clodia. We shall later find him a close friend of Cicero's again.

Macer the historian and democratic leader. A typical expression of this erroneous belief may be cited from Plessis, *Calvus*, p. 50: "l'homme qui lui avait pris la vie et l'honneur de son père ne pouvait lui inspirer que des sentiments de répulsion." The facts seem to be as follows: In the year 66 Licinius Macer was tried on an indictment of extortion<sup>13</sup> before Cicero who was then praetor, was condemned, and died immediately upon learning of his misfortune. To Cicero the situation was peculiarly difficult, because the culprit, who evidently had a bad case, was one of the foremost leaders of the democratic party to which Cicero also belonged at that time.<sup>14</sup> To Atticus who was very much concerned about the effects of the outcome of the trial upon Cicero's political standing, Cicero, apparently on the very day of the trial, wrote (Ad Att. I 4, 2): Nos hic incredibili ac singulari *populi* voluntate de C. Macro transegimus. *Cui cum aequi fuisset*, tamen multo maiorem fructum ex *populi* existimatione, illo condemnato, cepimus quam ex ipsius si absolutus esset gratia cepissemus. This passage seems invariably to be misinterpreted. In the first place, Boot's comment in his edition which is generally followed,<sup>15</sup> translates the cum-clause as though it had *potuisset*: "though I might have." Not in the whole range of Latin would it be possible to find a justification for this interpretation. It is a simple "cum-adversative" clause and means "though I *was* favorable." As a result of this misunderstanding we are told that the judge had betrayed Macer for political reasons and that as a natural result Macer's son Calvus became—what he never was—Cicero's life-long enemy. Another general error is due to the failure to see that Cicero in the trial retained the favor of his and Macer's party, for that can be the only meaning of the phrases: "Ex *populi* existimatione," and "incredibili ac singulari *populi* voluntate." What Cicero wished to explain to Atticus was this: "I have completed the trial without losing the popular good will. I was indeed favorable to him, but *despite his condemnation* I have gained more influence from popular approval than I could have gained from him

<sup>13</sup> Cic. Ad Att. I 4, 2; Plut. Cic. 9; Val. Max. 9, 12, 7.

<sup>14</sup> Cicero's defense of Cornelius in the following year in a case that was considered violently political shows that he had not yet broken with the party.

<sup>15</sup> See Tyrrell and Purser.



and his friends had he been acquitted." In other words, the people credited Cicero with showing a friendly attitude, in the small way that a judge might, and did not blame him for the conviction. That Cicero conducted himself with propriety we may assume even without Plutarch's guarantee that "this trial was considered very creditable to Cicero as showing his careful management of the court" (loc. cit. 9). We should add that Macer's death though natural was very sudden, and it will be seen that Plutarch's detailed and circumstantial account must rest upon good authority. Why historians persist in preferring the charge of suicide given by Valerius Maximus is difficult to comprehend, especially since his account is at once discredited by the erroneous statement that Macer was not condemned, and by the fact that his story is shaped to illustrate a moral. We have therefore no ground in this incident for supposing that Calvus had reason to dislike Cicero. Quite the contrary is true.<sup>16</sup>

---

The next time we meet Cicero and the *juvenes*, in the spring of 59, old political combinations had been shattered by Cæsar and his triumvirate. All groups were realigning to protect their interests in the face of new dangers. The *barbatuli* were doubtless severing old ties like the rest, and to some extent separating from each other, and it is hardly to be supposed that Clodia, now that her influential husband was dead and her own reputation branded in public harangues, could wield the same power over a large group as before. But Curio again appears, and still a leader of a troop of young men, this time, however, directing his attacks against Pompey and Cæsar. To some extent the personnel of the group must have been the same as before since Cicero's first designation is *sanguinaria juvenus*<sup>17</sup> which of course refers to *comissatores conjurationis*. The ambitious

<sup>16</sup> Cicero's statement seems needlessly condensed and I suspect that the original may have read: *tamen <multā indictā condemnatus est, sed> multo maiorem*, etc. In that case a copyist dropped the words from *multa* to *multo* by an error common to all scribes. However, we need not resort to emendation to understand the essential point, and Cicero wrote to Atticus who knew the situation, and not for later generations.

<sup>17</sup> Ad Att. II 7, 3.



young aristocrats of Rome had naturally discovered very quickly that the overwhelming power now wielded by Cæsar and Pompey would check the political advancement of any free lance, and they were too independent and radical to think with equanimity of having to submit to self-constituted dictators. It was after some three months of triumvirate tyranny that Curio met Cicero, who had retired to the country in disgust, and unbosomed his hatred of the *dynastæ* to him. Cicero was of course overjoyed to hear it, and from that time he usually refers to the young hot-head as *meus*. After this conversation Cicero wrote Atticus (II 7) that Curio, Megabocchus (?) and *hæc sanguinaria juven-tus* were in arms against the triumvirs, a statement which he somewhat elaborated a few days later by naming Metellus Nepos and Memmius (II 12, 2). The nickname in the former letter seems therefore to refer to one of these, and I would suggest that Metellus is meant and that the word should be read *Μεγάβυλος*. It will be remembered that Metellus Nepos, Clodia's brother-in-law, had been one of Pompey's officers in the Eastern wars, that in 63 he had returned to serve Pompey's interests as tribune at Rome and had brutally insulted Cicero in the attempt (Ad Fam. V 1 and 2). Since the word *metellus* means "mercenary soldier" and Megabyzos was apparently a Greek comic character (see Stephanus) borrowed from the circle of Persian courtiers to designate a type of miles gloriosus the name would seem peculiarly appropriate to this erratic and bombastic agent of the "Arabarches" Pompey. To anticipate, we may add that Metellus' dislike of Cæsar here mentioned did much to reconcile him with Cicero so that he was ready to support the latter in the troublous times of 57.

The mention of Memmius as a friend and sympathizer of Curio is no less interesting, for he too had been a friend of Pompey's but had incurred the latter's anger apparently by intrigues with Pompey's sister-in-law Mucia. Though Memmius was older than the *barbatuli*, like many of them he dabbled in erotic verse of the new style, and presently, as propraetor of Bithynia, took two of them, Catullus and Cinna, with him on his staff (Cat. 10). For several years he united with the younger group in their assaults upon Cæsar; Suetonius (Julius 49) names him with Calvus, Curio, Dolabella, Bibulus, Brutus, and Cicero as repeating scandals about Cæsar's youthful behavior. In 58

when praetor he with Domitius attempted to hale Cæsar to court, and his speeches against him during that year are mentioned by Suetonius (*ibid.* 23 and 73). In the winter of 55-4, he as well as Calvus and Catullus became reconciled to Cæsar, as Cicero had been the year before.

During the spring and summer of 59 party lines shaped themselves quickly. The triumvirs found it worth their while to cajole Clodius with promises, but the younger men were left unappeased and constantly drew closer to Cicero. In *Ad Att.* II 8 Cicero relates: (Curio) *narrabat incensam esse iuventutem neque ferre hæc posse.* Curio led the noisy revolvers and gained such popularity by it that when he entered the theatre in Cæsar's presence at the annual games of July he received an ovation of cheers (II 19, 3).

By October the young rebels had talked themselves into a frenzy, not without encouragement from Cicero who had one day dropped the characteristic remark that the time was ripe for a Brutus or a Servilius Ahala. Indeed Marcus Brutus, then only twenty (if we may believe Velleius), who traced descent from both of these tyrannicides of old, was soon mentioned as a member of the group. It is not likely that a serious plot was actually formed, but Cæsar knew well how quickly loose talk might suggest action; tyrant-baiting had often brought men fame at Rome and the young radicals would hardly be squeamish in the expression of their republicanism. At any rate, Vettius, a knight who had during the Catilinarian revolt nearly incurred ruin by an overzealous attempt to implicate Cæsar's name in that movement, now undertook again to meddle with conspiracy. Whether he suspected a plot and hoped by revealing it to set himself right with Cæsar or whether he thought the moment had come for avenging himself on Cæsar by bringing on a revolt, we cannot say. We are told that he approached Curio persistently with sanguinary proposals which the latter eventually revealed to his father, who reported them. Cæsar now made capital out of the affair and, if only to frighten the irresponsible youngsters, produced Vettius in the forum and called for a complete statement. Vettius, prompted we are told by Cæsar's henchman Vatinius, mentioned "a band of young men led by Curio,"<sup>18</sup> and further-

<sup>18</sup> *Manum iuventutis duce Curione.* *Ad Att.* II 24, 2.

more mentioned Paullus, Brutus, and Lentulus by name.<sup>19</sup> On the next day he withdrew Brutus' <sup>20</sup> name and added those of Laterensis and Piso, Cicero's young son-in-law, besides those of some older men; and he finally designated Cicero without using his name. As we have remarked, no real evidence of a plot was disclosed, but we may fairly conclude that Vettius could have mentioned only such persons as were known to be hostile to Pompey and Cæsar and to be on friendly terms with the alleged plotter, Curio.

Of Paullus we know little, but we learn later that he was Cicero's staunch supporter in the attacks upon Vatinius <sup>21</sup> and Gabinius, remaining his friend until the year 50 when he (as consul) and Curio deserted to Cæsar. Brutus may have been mentioned because of his inherited hostility to Pompey, but it is possible that he had close connections with the *iuventus* of which we are not informed. He too wrote verse in his youth, and he preceded Antony and Gallus in the affections of the beautiful actress, Cytheris. We know him best from the days when he associated with Cato, but his youth may have shown some traits of inheritance from his father, the revolutionist, and his none too Stoic mother, Servilia. That we hear little of him during the years following 59 is due to his protracted absence in Greek lands. Iuventius Laterensis can hardly be the youth mentioned frequently by Catullus though it is usually assumed that he was a relative since the name is rather rare.<sup>22</sup> He had firm republican convictions throughout life. In this very year he had refused to accept office on the terms imposed by Cæsar, and finally in 43 killed himself rather than betray the cause of Cicero and the Senate.<sup>23</sup> Of Piso's brief life we know only that he loyally supported his father-in-law until he died in 57.

<sup>19</sup> Cic. Ad Att. II 24; In Vat. 24-26; Plut. Luc. 42; App. B. C. II 12.

<sup>20</sup> Cicero implies that his mother Servilia had used her well-known influence over Cæsar to have this charge withdrawn.

<sup>21</sup> Cic. Quint. Fr. II 4 and III 1, 15.

<sup>22</sup> We need not assume that Iuventius in the poems of Catullus was a pseudonym, for though public opinion was not yet quite ripe for the acceptance of such verse, we have numerous indications that Catullus did not publish the collection we now have. Cf. Harnecker, *Neue Jahrb.* 133, 273; Frank, *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXXV 67 ff.

<sup>23</sup> Cic. Ad Att. II 18, 2; Fam. X 23, 4.

Of the "band of youth" led by Curio we have no further direct mention, but that Calvus and Catullus were with them, at least in sympathy, is quite evident. One of Calvus' most famous epigrams dealt with Caesar's youthful escapades in Bithynia,<sup>24</sup> and we know that Bibulus popularized this story in the street-bulletins which he posted during that year.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore the taunts at Pompey's effeminate manners which Calvus turned into an epigram<sup>26</sup> were also popular in 59.<sup>27</sup> But Calvus' attitude is shown most clearly in his persistent attacks upon Vatinius who did Caesar's menial work in the Vettius case. When Vatinius had ended his year of office so that he was subject to impeachment (Vettius was now dead), Calvus attempted to bring him to trial before Memmius, who was now praetor. Vatinius escaped only by the use of violence, driving both judge and prosecutor off the tribunal. Calvus, however, seems to have published the speech he had prepared, for his first oration against Vatinius "written when he was not much over twenty-two years of age" was still read and studied in the days of Tacitus and Quintilian,<sup>28</sup> and the poems of Catullus show that the *odium Vatini-ianum* of Calvus passed into a proverb. Nor did Calvus subside though foiled this once. While supporting Cicero in the defense of Sextius two years later he publicly announced that he would attack Vatinius again. The opportunity seems to have offered itself soon, and indeed his second speech was considered his best by his critics. Again in 54 though he had then become

<sup>24</sup> Cited by Suet. Jul. 49.

<sup>25</sup> *Edicta Bibuli quibus proscripsit collegam suum Bithynicam regnam, etc.* Suet. Jul. 49.

<sup>26</sup> *Digito caput uno.* Frag. P. Rom. Calvus 18. Two other lampoons of Calvus also attack persons derided by Cicero: the jibes at Curius (Frag. P. Rom. 1, cf. Asconius, Stangl, p. 72) and at Tigellius (F. P. R. 3; cf. Cic. Ad Fam. VII 24). Is it a mere coincidence that the only four lines of Calvus' epigrams that can be assigned to a definite subject express a hatred which the poet shares with Cicero?

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Dio 39, 18; Cicero mentions the *fasciae cretatae* in a letter at the end of 60, Ad Att. II 3. The mobs at Rome still harped on these things in 56: Quint Fr. II 3, 2; Plut. Pomp. 48.

<sup>28</sup> Calvus was twenty-four in 58, but Tacitus does not pretend to be very precise here. I have accepted the chronology of the speeches as arranged in Schanz I, II, p. 218. The account of the trial is given by Cicero's speech In Vat. 34, delivered in Calvus' presence.



reconciled to Cæsar, he still nourished his hatred for his old enemy and brought him to court a third time. It is difficult to escape the thought that the plot of Vettius and its manipulation by Vatinius had struck close to the deepest concerns of Calvus.

As for his friend Catullus, there is a cruel epigram of his which commentators from Scaliger to Ellis have been inclined to connect with Vettius. It is No. 98, in which the manuscripts give the otherwise unknown name Victius.

In te si in quemquam dici pote, putide Victi,  
id quod verbosis dicitur et fatuis.  
Ista cum lingua, si usus veniat tibi, possis  
culos et crepidas lingere carpatinas.  
Si nos omnino vis omnes perdere, Victi,  
deiscas: omnino quod cupis efficias.

For the usual identification I can do no better than quote the note of Ellis: "The persistency with which Cicero attaches the words *index, indicium* to Vettius was doubtless meant to convey a slur; while the words of Catullus *ista cum lingua*, etc., find a practical commentary in Cicero's language *ibi tu indicem Vettium linguam et vocem suam sceleri et menti tuæ præbere voluisti* (In Vat. 24), just as *si nos omnino vis omnes perdere Vetti*, is well illustrated by Cicero's *civitatis lumina notasset* (ibid. 26)." Hendrickson who in Rhein. Mus. 59, 478, convincingly argues for reading *deiscas* (= *dehiscas*), rejects this identification, believing that the epigram is a representative of the same genre as Anth. Pal. II 148:

μηδὲ λαλῶν πρόην ἐσολοίκισε Φλάκκος ὁ ῥήτωρ  
καὶ μέλλων χεῖναι εὐθὺς ἐβαρβάρισεν.

It must be admitted that Ellis' interpretation is far from proved, but even if the epigram is modelled upon a common Greek form, Catullus' studies usually keep in touch with actual experiences, and the reference in this case seems to be not to a mere babbler or solecist. If the strong language of the epigram was justified it would seem to refer to some creature who wielded a foul and venomous tongue. We must leave the question without a decision, but we can hardly escape the conviction that the epigram well fits the personality of the reckless informer and the emotions of fear and disgust that Catullus could not but have felt when so many of his friends were for the moment involved in

extreme danger. That the danger was very real appears from Cicero's own confession (II 24, 4) that he had for a moment expected a judicial massacre: *vitae taedet: ita sunt omnia omnium miseriarum plenissima. Modo caedem timueramus, quam oratio fortissimi senis Q. Considi discusserat*; and Plutarch (Caes. 14) shows how general was the terror.

For two years after the Vettius fiasco we hear less of the *iuvenes* partly because of Cicero's banishment, partly because several of the young men left Rome. Cicero was exiled in April, 58. Brutus went to Cyprus with Cato soon after. Curio remained at Rome doing what, with his somewhat shattered influence, he could accomplish for Cicero (Ad Fam. II 1, 2). Where Calvus was for two years after his first attack upon Vatinius we do not know. There is no speech of his mentioned that can be assigned to this period. Perhaps he retired for the time to write his *Io*. Memmius invited Catullus and Cinna to his province Bithynia in 57.

Cicero returned late in 57, and in February of 56 undertook with Calvus and others the defence of Sestius. Since this man had incurred the indictment in Cicero's service, Calvus' stand by the side of Cicero is significant of his friendship for Cicero. Furthermore when during the trial Cicero took the occasion to attack Vatinius, Calvus and Paullus both offered to bring a new indictment against the hated creature, and this pledge Calvus seems to have paid, as we have remarked above.<sup>29</sup>

Cicero's next case of importance was a defence of Caelius on an indictment concocted by Clodia with whom the latter had now quarrelled. As we noticed above he had been drawn into Clodia's band of revellers after his return from Africa, or if we may believe Cicero, who abbreviates as much as possible the account of his lapse from public life, sometime after the trial of Antonius in April 59. At any rate it is likely that his pre-occupations at Baiae saved him from the Vettian entanglement.<sup>30</sup> When, then, in 57 Caelius had attempted to wrench

<sup>29</sup> This is supposed to be the occasion of the incident recorded in Catullus 53. That Catullus was socially on good terms with Sestius is apparent from Cat. 44, 10.

<sup>30</sup> See Pro Caelio 74-5. He had been a very good friend of Catullus for some time.

himself back to serious work he was summoned into court on a long list of charges that prove if nothing else the vengeful spirit and lively imagination of Clodia. Cicero laughed the charges out of court; and of course Calvus, always Catullus' best friend, was not at Cicero's side in this case. Catullus had probably not yet returned from Bithynia, but we may well suppose that on his return he read the speech with a fair degree of complacency and decided that Caelius had been sufficiently punished. At any rate the poet's later references to Caelius indicate that the two were reconciled, and both Caelius and Curio presently appear associated with the literary tendencies that were promoted by Calvus. Later in the year Cicero attacked Piso, Cæsar's father-in-law, and Gabinius, Pompey's henchman, in the *De provinciis consularibus* and again in 55 gave Piso a sound drubbing in the *In Pisonem* though he had already declared his submission to the triumvirs. If, as seems likely, the "Priapus" of Catullus 47 and of 28 is this man, the poet was in hearty accord with Cicero in this attack also.<sup>31</sup> During the next year Cicero, to escape further humiliation, spent most of his time at his villas in literary work, while Calvus and Catullus kept up their epigrammatic fusillade at Cæsar and Pompey and their favorites Vatinius, Mamurra and Labienus. From this time we have apparently the terribly direct:

Quis hoc potest videre, quis potest pati (C. 29)

the last line of which

Socer generque perdidistis omnia

was quoted by Vergil (Catalepton 6) and seems to have been the shot that brought Cæsar to terms (Suet. Jul. 73). But there were also other stinging jibes at Mamurra (Nos. 57, 41, 43) and four equally bitter ones at Labienus, under the nickname Mentula (94, 105, 114, 115).

And here we must turn aside once more in order to justify this last identification which for some strange reason seems to have been overlooked. A glance at nos. 114 and 115 will show

<sup>31</sup> Besides the arguments given by Schwabe, we may add that Catullus XIII, a dinner invitation to Fabullus, Piso's friend, is modelled upon one sent to Piso by Philodemus, Anth. Pal. XI 44, hardly a mere coincidence. Could it be that *Socratio* of Cat. 47 is a fling at Philodemus?

that the usual identification with Mamurra is impossible since the person in question is from Firmum whereas Mamurra was a native of Formiae.

1. Catullus distinctly calls the man he is attacking *Firmanus*, 114, 1. Now Cicero in *Pro Rabirio*, 22, states that Labienus was a Picentine, and Cæsar tells us that Labienus had expended large sums in building Cingulum which is in the territory of Firmum.<sup>32</sup> Apparently his paternal estates were there.

2. From Catullus 114 and 115 we also learn that the victim of the epigram had acquired vast estates *usque ad Hyperboreos et mare ad Oceanum* which could only mean that Cæsar had bestowed Gallic lands upon him. This too fits the complaint of Cicero *Ad Att.* 7, 7, 6, that great wealth had been given Labienus as well as Mamurra, and the well-known passage of Dio 41, 4, that Cæsar had so enriched Labienus that he behaved as the equal of his master. To explain Catullus' phrase *fructus sumptibus exsuperat* (114, 4) we may then refer to Cæsar's statement of the expenditures upon 'Cingulum.'

3. The name Labienus the poet avoided whether because of its metrical obstinacy or in order to conceal in some measure the identity of his victim. In search for a suitable substitute his train of thought apparently ran thus: Labienus—labia—mentum, and the obvious simplicity of this seems to prove the identity correct.<sup>33</sup>

Thus we have gained another point of common sympathy between Cicero and Catullus, for Cicero's violent attack upon Labienus in his speech *Pro Rabirio* and the later remark about

<sup>32</sup> Cingulo, quod oppidum Labienus constituit suaque pecunia exaedicaverat, *Bell. Civ.* I 15.

<sup>33</sup> If anyone should still doubt the identity, let him remember Labienus' praenomen and read *Carmen* 94 in the light of the scholia of Persius' first satire. It may be of some interest that *Carmen* 105:

Mentula conatur Pipleium scandere montem:  
Musae furcillis praecipitem eiciunt.

reveals Labienus as a man of literary ambitions. We are not told what Muse he was pursuing, but it may be that, since he thought his commander did him less than justice (*Dio* 41, 4), he undertook to write a history of his own deeds. His son, the rhetorician, later wrote histories which were publicly burned for their strong support of Pompey (*Senec. Controv. X* praef. 4).



*Labieni divitiae* of Ad Att. 7, 7, 6 show that the two were entirely in accord here as elsewhere.

This campaign of abuse by the poets was keenly felt by Cæsar, and while he still continued to neglect Curio and Caelius he made friendly offers to both Calvus and Catullus in the winter of 55-4.<sup>34</sup> Cicero had already submitted to the inevitable the year before, and his two friends accepted the terms offered and sealed the pact with gentle words. But just as Cicero still for some time continued his open enmity to the subordinates, Piso, Gabinius, and Vatinius, so Calvus once more found occasion to bring an indictment against Vatinius in August of 54 (Ascon. p. 18, Clark) delivering his third oration against his inveterate enemy. This time Cicero at Cæsar's request undertook the defense, but that this act did not imply a serious disagreement between the old friends is indicated by the fact that on July 27 they labored together in the defense of Messius who had supported Cicero in the evil days of his exile.<sup>35</sup>

I have gone thus fully into the cases of these years of confused issues for the sake of showing how thoroughly in accord the three men were. It is from this background that we must estimate the tone of Catullus' well-known lines to Cicero in Carmen 49:

Disertissime Romuli nepotum  
quot sunt quotque fuere, Marce Tulli,  
quotque post aliis erunt in annis,  
gratias tibi maximas Catullus  
agit pessimus omnium poeta,  
tanto pessimus omnium poeta  
quanto tu optimus omnium patronus.

There is a school of commentators, induced presumably by the modern fashion of deriding Cicero, that insists upon finding sarcasm in these lines. Many readers have in turn pointed out that a natural interpretation of every word and phrase<sup>36</sup> leaves

<sup>34</sup> Catullus 11 and 55, 6 reveal the change of tone which followed the *cena* at Verona mentioned by Suet. Jul. 73. Since Calvus defended Gaius Cato, the hateful triumvirate tribune, in July 54 (Cic. Ad Att. IV 16, 5; Ascon. p. 18 Clark), we may assume that the two made their peace with Cæsar about the same time. Indeed Suetonius mentions Calvus first.

<sup>35</sup> Ad Att. 4, 15, 9 and Sen. Controv. 7, 4, 8.

<sup>36</sup> *Disertissimus* is regularly a word of high praise. *Romuli nepotum*; cf. its elevated tone in 23, 15; 34, 22; 58, 5. *Pessimus poeta*, the poet's

no room for any cynical point. But all this is of no avail: a lampoon seems to be more interesting than a eulogy. Nevertheless if an historical review such as we have attempted reveals only friendship and community of sympathies between Cicero and these poets this fact must be considered of some account in tracking out the purport of this poem. The point of the sting, if there is one, must lie in the last line. But I think it will be agreed that from the point of view of legal ethics at Rome Cicero had steered an acceptable course in the choice of his clients up to his defense of Vatinius in August 54. He may indeed have disappointed Calvus and Catullus by his reconciliation with Cæsar in 56, the year before they took the same course, but his praise of Cæsar in the *De Prov. Cons.* could not be called the speech of a *patronus*, and they could have taken no umbrage at the only other defense of a Cæsarian of the period, Cornelius Balbus. It is very doubtful whether Catullus lived to see the defense of Vatinius—which many criticized—but even if he did, he and Calvus had then gone quite as far as Cicero in writing palinodes, and Calvus had before that act even defended the obnoxious Gaius Cato who was hateful to the whole group. It is equally difficult to find any earlier date in which to place a fling at Cicero. As we have seen he differed from the devotees of Clodia in the Clodian farce but in that case it was they, not he, that laid themselves open to a charge of instability. And we have every reason to think that there was nothing but abiding friendship between the men from 59 to 56 demonstrated in their mutual associations as well as in their common hatred towards Vatinius, Clodius, Piso, Cæsar, Labienus, and Mamurra.<sup>37</sup> Ca-

modesty is well illustrated in 14 b; and if the objection be raised that the repetition of the phrase implies quotation marks, it is quite possible to imagine that some Vatinius or Clodius, wounded by the poet's lampoons, had first used the phrase and that Cicero had come to the poet's defence. Such an assumption would explain the purpose of *gratias tibi maximas*. See also Harnecker, *Philol.* 41, 475, and the sane comment in Merrill's edition.

<sup>37</sup> Cicero and Catullus agree to a surprising extent in their opinions of those whom both happen to mention. We have already spoken of Calvus, Caelius, Cæsar, Clodius, Labienus, Mamurra, Memmius, Piso, Pollio, Pompey, Sestius, Vatinius and Vettius. To this list may be added: Arrius (Catullus 84), Nepos (1), Cornificius (38), Gellius (74), Hortensius (65), Manlius (61, see Schanz I, II 354), Nonius (52),

tullus 49 must be restored to its proper place as a genuine expression of gratitude and reverence which the modest poet always felt for the man whom he had found on his arrival at Rome the lauded hero of all Italy.

Soon after the death of Catullus new political currents began to set in. Old combinations drew apart and new ones formed around Cæsar and Pompey who in 53 began to show signs of disagreement. Cæsar, whose hold upon the imagination of young and ambitious men was always strong, pursued the policy he had disclosed in winning over Calvus and Catullus. He also made peace with Memmius and supported him for the consulship. The latter, however, bungled his part, disclosed the terms of the contract and earned nothing but banishment for his pains. Cæsar invited Mark Antony from Greece, and presently he made a place for Asinius Pollio, another, though younger, friend of Catullus, Cinna, and Cicero.<sup>38</sup> Caelius was still under a cloud and could for the present be neglected, but he travelled the same road in 50. Curio had useful qualities but Cæsar thought he might well be tamed by a season of neglect.<sup>39</sup> Besides Cicero who had always retained a strong hold upon the young man engaged his services<sup>40</sup> in 53 as campaign manager for Milo, thus retaining him for a while with the group friendly to the Senate. But when Curio became tribune in 50, Cæsar came to terms with him. Paullus also, who had nibbled at the bait of generous loans as early as 55, is said to have sold out during his consulship in the same critical year of 50. Cæsar wanted Brutus also but the influence of the latter's relatives, Cato and Claudius, apparently saved him for the conservative party. Cicero, ultimately threw

Valerius Cato (56). The identity has not in every case been established with certainty but so far as Schwabe and Ellis are able to supply the facts, the poet and the orator seem to be nearly of the same opinion in all instances.

<sup>38</sup> See Cat. Carm. 12; Cinna's Propempticon, and Cic. Ad Fam. I 6, 1, written in 56 when Pollio was about 20.

<sup>39</sup> Cic. Fam. 8, 4, 2.

<sup>40</sup> When Curio was in the East in 53 Cicero wrote him how he missed their *jucundissima consuetudo*, Fam. II 1. The letters of the same year written after the death of Curio's father, show that Cicero then considered himself privileged to stand in *loco parentis* to the young man. The reference to Milo is found in Fam. II 6, 4; *Dux nobis et auctor opus est*.

in his lot with Pompey, though very grudgingly, and he never severed cordial relations with the young friends<sup>41</sup> who chose to follow Cæsar.

The civil war came on in 49, and after a world-rending struggle of eighteen months, Pompey met his death, and most of the senatorial leaders who remained submitted to Cæsar. Curio and Caelius had both fallen in hot-headed ventures, Calvus lived on for a brief period, apparently till 46,<sup>42</sup> and Cicero retired to a life of literary seclusion. He found, now that he had time for thought that the world of letters was drifting away from his leadership, that his own ideals of an artistic prose style in particular were falling upon evil days and that a school of directer expression was winning ever more adherents.<sup>43</sup> A typical expression of this impatience on the part of the very young against the ample and leisurely style is Vergil's youthful outburst (Catal. V):

Ite hinc inanes ite *rhetorum ampullae*  
inflata rhoso non *Achaico* verba.

That pointed rejection of the *ampullae* for the Attic style was probably written in the year 47,<sup>44</sup> by a devoted believer in Cæsar and an admirer of Calvus and Catullus. Cicero was perhaps too near himself and his age to realize what was changing the trend, but to us who have lived through a harrowing world war, it seems only natural that a change in literary ideals was inevitable in those years of revolution and distress. The new world was growing impatient at words. Responding to his disturbing discovery Cicero began to formulate his opinions which he published in the *Brutus* in 46 and in the *Orator* and the *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* which quickly followed. Calvus and Brutus soon ex-

<sup>41</sup> In 49 he corresponded with Curio and Caelius though they were in Cæsar's camp, and for a few days he seems to have entertained thoughts of inducing them to revolt to Pompey. See Ad Att. X 10 and 12, and Class. Phil. 1919, 287.

<sup>42</sup> See Sternkopf, Neue Jahrb. 1893, 432.

<sup>43</sup> Cicero states more than once that the Atticists did not succeed in drawing a crowd (cf. *Brutus* 289), but if this be true it may be due to the fact that in these strenuous times men had something else to do than gather about the tribunals. The complete victory of the new school is evidence of its power to satisfy the demands of the time.

<sup>44</sup> See Vergil's Apprenticeship, Class. Phil. 1920.



pressed their dissent from the principles laid down by Cicero, and a friendly controversy ensued.<sup>45</sup> How Cæsar expressed himself we do not know but we could make a fair conjecture regarding the "philological" table talk during Cæsar's famous visit to Cicero in 45 (Ad Att. 13, 52). In this controversy Cicero was doomed by his long years of practice to vote against the inevitable trend, but in his judgment on poetry he had less at stake, and could feel with the post-bellum generation when it turned against the poets of the ante-bellum decade.

There is no need to discuss here the origin of the theories that lay behind the disputation nor have I any desire to belittle possible influences of the Greek text-books and teachers that had long discussed the relative merits of Athenian orators. Calvus himself insisted that he was consciously following the practice of Attic orators (Brut. 284) while Cicero hinted that this argument was an afterthought assumed to hide limitations of power.<sup>46</sup> Cicero in turn makes it plain that the most characteristic quality in his own style had its source in natural predilections and that his rhetorical training provided a check rather than an essential ingredient (Brutus 316). I have called attention to the part apparently played by the war simply because men of affairs, as all of these men were, generally react to daily experiences rather than to bookish rules in their manner of expression; and in this case it is apparent that the controversy about theoretical principles arose after the disputants had formed their characteristic styles in the hurly-burly<sup>47</sup> of the law courts. For our present purpose the main point is that even here there was no shadow of enmity between Cicero and Calvus. When the latter had died, and Trebonius in reference to the epistolary controversy asked Cicero why he had praised Calvus so highly, Cicero answered: I did so partly because it is a good principle to encourage the

<sup>45</sup> Now that we can date Ad Fam. 15, 21 late in 46 or early in 45 we can secure a reasonable chronology for Cicero's controversy with Calvus and Brutus mentioned by Tacitus, Dial. 18.

<sup>46</sup> Tusc. Disp. II 3. The correspondence between Calvus and Cicero made up a corpus of at least three books.

<sup>47</sup> Hendrickson, Class. Phil. I, p. 97, has proved that the controversy over purity of diction was a significant part of the discussion and that there are evidences of diversity of opinion on this point as early as 55 B. C.

man you criticize, but also because *de ingenio ejus valde existimavi bene*, Ad Fam. 15, 21, 4. Thus vanishes the "life-long hatred" between the two men.

As we have remarked Cicero also lived to see a similar change of attitude toward the dominating poetry of the decade that preceded the war, but being less concerned with verse he was able to respond to the new taste while the younger men—they were largely the very same group—were the ones who suffered from the reaction. It was of course not against the simple directness of such verse as Catullus' lyrics that the experiences of the war awakened a revulsion. Had these *poetae novi* applied the basic principles of Attic art to all their verse-writing as Catullus at least did in some of his *nugae* they might have fared better. But the preciousness of diction, the disregard of proportion in their purple-patch narratives, the affectation in metrical devices culled from Alexandria, and perhaps most of all the strained sentimentality of the erotic content were marks of a decadent trend that seems to have affected a large body of the epyllia produced in the decade before the war. Any severe shock that would bring Rome back to appreciate the realities of life was bound to open a volume of criticism at such tendencies. Cicero had himself been temporarily carried away by these enticing vices. He had played at composing epyllia, and had even gone the length of dabbling in the Alexandrian form that Catullus practiced in the Iuventus group, verses which his detractors wilfully distorted into records of personal experience.<sup>48</sup> Some of this he doubtless did in the days when he was associating with the iuventus whose moods he could so well appreciate and reproduce.<sup>49</sup> Cicero utters not a word of objection during the decade when he stood close to the group. At the end of the year 50 on his return from Cilicia he drops a goodnatured remark about the spondaic lines of the neoteri.<sup>50</sup> In and after the third year of the war when he had begun his controversy with the Atticists he also revealed at times that he was not fully in accord with the poetic practices of the *poetae novi*<sup>51</sup> who were to some extent the same men. But he

<sup>48</sup> For the amusing gullibility of Pliny on this point see Epist. VII 4, 3-6.

<sup>49</sup> See Pro Caelio 40-42.

<sup>50</sup> Ad Att. 7, 21.

<sup>51</sup> Tusc. Disp. 3, 45; Cic. Or. 161 and 68.

apparently did not care to enter into a controversy on the subject.

Vergil shows what seems to be a similar reaction in the poem cited above. In his schooldays he had fallen under the influence of the neoterici as the *Ciris*<sup>52</sup> and some of the *Catalepton* show, but in the days of stress his eyes were opened. In the fifth *Catalepton* in which he bids farewell to the *rhethorum ampullae* of his old-fashioned schoolmasters he also shuts the door on the Muses though grudgingly, ending with the significant invitation:

tamen meas chartas  
revisitote, sed *pudenter* et raro.

It was a chastened muse that returned, and it was not a mere accident, and surely not merely the influence of literary models, that led the greater poets of the next generation to realize the high calling of literature in sane and dignified work. Vergil and Horace were just old enough in their schooldays to feel the charm of the gifted group that held Rome in thrall before the crash of 49, but they also lived through the harrowing decade that followed, old enough to read the lessons of life it afforded, and their subsequent work proves how penetratingly they had read.

To conclude, it would seem that the band of *iuvenes* who in political matters frequently gathered about Curio between 61 and 55, the *poetae novi* best represented by Calvus and Catullus and the Atticists who accepted the leadership of Calvus were to a greater extent than is generally assumed one and the same circle, that this group had very close personal relations with Cicero from the year 59 until its more important members died, and that the diversity of literary opinions between Cicero and the group came to a conscious expression only through the exigencies of the civil war.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

<sup>52</sup> See Vergil's Apprenticeship, *Class. Phil.* 1920, on the Vergilian authorship of these poems.

#### IV. DECLENSION EXPONENTS AND CASE ENDINGS

Despite all the obloquy and suspicion that has attached for some years past to the agglutinative theory in its application to Indo-European grammar no competent student in that field doubts, I suppose, that the augment *e-* was a legitimate word (call it particle if you will) of the mother speech; nor that the imperative ending *-tōd* (in OLat. *legitod*) was a form of an IE. pronoun meaning thence or there. In the Latin (and Celtic) future *-bo* was certainly once an independent word and meant I become (or am).<sup>1</sup>

The augment *e* was a deictic adverb meaning something like here or there. I say something like because our modern English is poor in deictics and *e* may have been functionally near 'that' as well as 'there.' The augment *e* is not to be separated from the so-called preposition *ē/ǝ*, rendered by Brugmann as quasi dar (Gr. 2. 2, § 634). This *e* I have also identified with the vocative ending of the *o*-declension and (chiefly in adverbs) as an instrumental-locative ending (see AJPh. 37. 167<sup>2</sup>; 179 § 28). On the vocative-locative relation see Barnum's Grammatical Fundamentals of Innuït, pp. 89 sq. In IE. sobriquets of the (Robin) Red-Breast type (vocative) *e* (deflected to *o*) passed into a usage (in the subsequently developed paradigm) which legitimates our conception of it as a stem (AJPh. 38. 84 § 5). In Shakespeare's

O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome

as well as in the taunt of the naughty children to Elisha

Go up, thou Bald Head

the entire genesis of the IE. compound proper name of Bāhuvrīhi type stands clear to view. By way of illustration, if we

<sup>1</sup> Apropos of my identification in JAOS. 34. 331 sq. of the type of the Sanskrit genitive plural *asmākam* (of us) with Lat. *mecum*, I may be permitted to cite from a written communication of that highly conservative scholar, Professor Wackernagel (dated Basel, 11. IX. 15): "ich beglückwünsche sie zu der schönen für mich überzeugenden deutung von *asmākam* u. genossen."—I here add that if Av. *aēvā-kam* means simul it deserves the etymological rendering of unā cum.



put (Robin) Red-Breast into the (Latin for) IE. vocative \**Rufepectes* (red-there breast) the combination would yield (after the initial vocative accent), in accord with the normal principles of IE. phonology, \**Rúfopectes*, whence a secondary nominative \**Rufopectēs*. The vocative of Sk. *máhi* (IE. *i*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1. § 102. 2) certainly appears in the two Rig Veda vocatives *mahenadi* (O Big-river) and *mahemate* (magnanime).

The thematic vowel, then, so far as it appears in noun compounds, will be the independent IE. deictic *e* (deflected to *o*), starting as a vocative exponent.

We are warranted, on the evidence of several IE. tongues, in positing the deictics *ī* and *ū* (?*ū*). We have *ī* in *óivoo-t* and in Lat. *qui* (from *quo* + *ī*) and *ī* in the well-known locative ending; also in the vocative of *i*-stems. In Indo-Iranian, deictic *u* attaches itself enclitically, with the force of Lat. *quidem*, to pronouns (and infinitives). As *-e*, deflected to *-o*, eventually yielded the thematic vowel of the *o*-declension, so the deictics *i* and *u*, functioning first as vocatives then as declension exponents (see AJPh. 38. 230), will have yielded the *i*- and *u*-<sup>2</sup> declensions. A precise differentiation of *e/o* *i* *u* it were rash to essay, but Lat. *hic* (ego-deictic) *iste* (tu-deictic) and *ille* present one line of possible differentiation (by proximity), though the real difference may have turned on mobility<sup>3</sup> (static vs. mobile); or on contrast between the living and non-living, general or particular, personal or impersonal, or on some remoter factor like those exhibited in the 17 Bantu categories. Note the variation between *o* and *i* in Lat. *animus: exanimis* and, conversely, in Skr. *dr̥ṣī-* (cf. *dr̥ṣ-*): *-dr̥ṣa-*. As

<sup>2</sup>Here I raise the question whether the locatives *ókoi* and *ókoi* contain the sum of the deictics *e/o* + *i*; and whether in the *i*-declension the locative in *-ēi* contains the sum of *ē* + *i*. Or was *-ei* (cf. Lat. *ei*, the interjection) a separate deictic? A like question arises even more pointedly for the vocatives in *-ei* and *-eu*, competing with *-i* and *-u* vocatives. If *-ei* in the vocative is synchytic (cf. the feminine vocative in *-ai*, AJPh. 38. 85), or if IE. *ei* was a different cry to *i*, then no such relation as what we call gradation genetically obtains between the competing vocative endings; i. e. no relation comparable to the gradation in *λεῖπω* and *λεπών*: like effects, but different causes.

<sup>3</sup>If the note be one of mobility, the deictic *i* will hardly be different from the root *i*, to go.

regards the welding of *e i u* with shorter, let us say, root, nouns like *d̥r̥c-*, we may note how in Basque the deictic word *a*, equivalent to the English definite article, is joined to *zald̥i*, horse, yielding *zald̥ia*, the horse. As evidence of alternation of *o* and *i* deictics we may cite trite examples such as Lat. *agilis*: Sk. *ajirá*, περκνός: Sk. *p̥r̥cni*, ὁμαλός χαμαλός: Lat. *similis humilis*. Add Lat. *pronus*, fem. *pronis* (Varro), Sk. *arká/arcí* (:monosyllabic *árc*), *ghr̥ná/gh̥ní*, ἀπᾱστή/i-, Av. *ašta/i*. For *o/i/u* I note Av. *raox̥šna/i/u*, Sk. *kr̥id̥á/i/ú*; for *ĩ/ũ* Sk. *puñ̥ṣcat̥h̥/ú*, cf. *k̥ir̥i/k̥ar̥ú*. It is certainly an attractive notion that in Av. *raox̥šna* *raox̥šni* *raox̥šnu* (cf. also *raox̥šnā* = Lat. *Luna*) the *a i u* designated lights at different distances.

The IE. Dative.—The Latin interjection *ei* (see fn. above) is certainly not to be separated from Av. *āi* (with vocative). Bartholomae also recognizes *āi* after an accusative as a preposition (*anāp̥em āi* = desertwards). From this *āi* I infer IE. *ēi*, deflected to *ōi*, as the source of the dative of the IE. *o*-declension.—Systematically, we should assign to an *i*-stem like Sk. *arcí* an IE. dative in *ēi*, though the form might rather have originated with a monosyllabic stem like Sk. *árc*. The deflected variant in *ōi* we should assign to an *o*-stem like Sk. *arká*, but it were well to recognize a period of, shall I say, heteroclisia, prior to the organization of the declensions.—As Av. *āi* (towards) explains the terminal dative, even better Av. *āi*: Lat. *ei* explains the emotional dative (cf. CQ. 5. 195 § 33).

In Greek the interjection *ai* corresponds with Lat. *ei*, and exhibits the vowel color of the dative in the IE. consonant declension. This deictic and emotional *ai* supplies an ideal source for the IE. imperative-infinitive,—the Latin exclamatory infinitive; cf. Od. 24, 376, *ai γάρ . . . τοῖος ἐών* (nominative!) . . . τεύχε' ἔχων ὤμοισιν, ἐφεστώμεναι (= utinam stetissem). With the infinitive of exclamation the Latin historical infinitive (nominative subject) in impassioned narrative should be combined (infinitive of excitement). In the expression of emotion language is at its earliest. The cry long antedated the word.

Other deictics severally entered into combination with nouns (rootnouns) and developed other cases. In Oscan we have *es* <sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>One may wonder if the movable *s-* that plays so large a rôle with roots is a deictic, originally functioning somewhat as the augment *e*.

and *is* (= Lat. *is*) in *es-ídum* / *is-ídum* (= Lat. *idem*). Who wills may call *es* and *is* nominatives of the "stems" *e* and *i*, but to my mind *es* (subsequently deflected to *-os*) and *is* are precasuals, and it by no means follows that they are extensions of the "roots" *e* and *i*.

What subsequently became the accusative will have developed from the deictic *ēm/ōm*, extant in Greek in the interjection *ἦν*, *ecce* (Lat. *ēn* is probably borrowed; cf. *h-em*). We have *em* in the "reduplicated" Sanskrit accusatives *im-ám* (hunc) and *am-úm* (illum), for which I miss in Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2 pp. 327, 343, due reference to AJPh. 20, 160; though in fact, in a genetic and chronological regard, in calling *am* a particle the first edition of the Grundriss was the correcter. The IE. deictic *em* (there) is the source of the IE. preposition *en*,<sup>5</sup> with proethnic *n* from *m* before dentals, and especially in the words *ens* (whence *eis*) and *enter*<sup>6</sup> (Lat. *inter*). The dissyllabic form *eni* (:ni) will owe its *n* to composition forms with *eny-* (*ny-*). From the deictic sense of *em* came the prepositional senses of to by at in on.

From the deictic *ēm/ōm*<sup>7</sup> at least two case forms developed,

<sup>5</sup>But Lat. *em*, there, is, in whole or in part, from the IE. locative *esmi*, see CP. 10. 338.

<sup>6</sup>I agree with Bartholomae, Gr. Ir. Phil. 1. 61, that the Indo-European nasals were homorganic, save where recomposition was in play, as later in Lat. *adem*<*p*>*tus* and the Germanic words with *mp*. Bartholomae has duly accounted for Lith. *dėszimt(is)*, ten, as containing *m* after a lost Baltic equivalent of Lat. *decimus*. His further notion that *szim̃tas*, hundred, has followed the cue of *dėszimt* gains in probability when we set *dėszimt̃sis*, *decimus ille*, alongside of *szimt̃sis*, *centesimus ille*. One may also wonder whether from an IE. primate *sm̃ k̃ntom* (:ē-karor, one hundred), spoken as two words, we may not derive, prior to the Baltic change of *-m* to *-n*, a pre-Lithuanian \**sim* (? or *sim*<*p*>) \**szintas* whence, with assimilation of spirants and nasals, haplological *szim̃[szim]tas*. Further, Lithuanian was full of recomposed infinitives in *-mti(s)*. Supposing a time of shift in these infinitives from *-inti(s)* to *-imti(s)*, the replacement of *nt* by *mt* may have carried over to *szim̃tas*. Possibly in *gentis*, kinsman, *nt* (from proethnic *mt*) escaped this general recomposition, for the root is in fact the root of *gemū*, I am born (cf., with due modifications, Schleicher, Lit. Hdbch. p. 116).

<sup>7</sup>If Meillet is right (see MSL. 9. 365; not disproved by Hermann, KZ. 41. 16) proethnic *-n* yielded in Latin and Sanskrit *-m*. On this supposition we may write our deictic as IE. *ēn/ōn*.

viz. the accusative singular and the genitive plural. By case we mean primarily relation; only secondarily did relation become associated with form. How very fluid remained the association with form may be realized by any one who will look over the tale of mixed cases—I often find myself wondering if anybody can think of the cases as having ever been unmixed, or less mixed—as cast up by Audouin in his valuable *Déclinaison dans les Langues Indo-Européennes*. In point of relation, dissociated from form, the prius of a compound is absolutely fluid and stands in any conceivable grammatical commerce with its posterius. Formally, all that the prius amounts to is an invariable (the “stem”) firmly fixed before the posterius. Their mutual relation (or “case”) is a mere inference. The only solid fact is the rigid juxtaposition. As we legitimately analyze syntactic relations by assuming parataxis, so by parataxis case-relations may be restored, anticipated, realized. From the deictic *es/os* we may illustrate the rise of the genitive<sup>8</sup> as well as of the nominative: from IE. *n(e)r-os pō(d)s* (man-there foot) came *ἀνδρὸς πός* (man’s foot); from IE. *neros* (*?noros*)<sup>9</sup> *peteti* (man-there falls) came Skr. *narah patati* (the man falls). From IE. *ped(e)m pāwyo* (foot-there I strike) came Lat. *pedem pavo*; cf. *ποδῶν* (gen. plur.) *ἔλαβον*, (by) the feet I seized (note in Gothic the gen. pl. in *ē[m]*, as in *fadrē*). If the “accusative” was originally a word followed by *ēm/ōm* (there; at in on by etc.), then the transitive type “I strike the table” did not originally differ from “I strike on the table.” The competition of accusative (*-em/om*) and genitive (*-ōm/ēm*) is especially significant in their exclamatory usage (Latin accusative, Greek genitive), wherein the ending will have had the exclamatory note of *ἦν*, lo! In Indo-Iranian the deictic *ēm* (as well as *e*) is attached to locatives (see Brugmann Gr. 2. 2, § 177. 2 for examples).

The restoration of the prepositional force of *-em* is particularly significant for the terminal accusative, which Varro (L. L. 8. 16) divined to be the accusative *par excellence*. By our

<sup>8</sup> See also Bull. Univ. Texas, no. 263 § 99 sq.

<sup>9</sup> See Bull. § 104. The o-grade nouns like *bhoros* have secondary deflection; cf. *véos*, new, with the e-vocalism that one expects in a noun that never functioned as a posterius: also note e-grade of *fépyov* etc.



analysis, *dom-um* yields *house-there* (to the house, in aedes). In reverse order, *ἐν-δον* is *there-house* (in the house, in aedibus); IE. *dom* (deflected, I take it, in vocalization from original *dem*) is a word, uninflected, and prior to inflection as we now conceive it.

Postscript. My colleague, Professor Prokosch, who has been good enough to read this paper critically, calls my attention to the following analogies. (1) The Magyar definite nominatives as in *savam savad sava* "the word," as spoken by me, by you, by some one else: such forms are clear compounds of root nouns with the personal pronouns *en te ő*. The 15 Finnish and 18 Magyar cases, and (I add) the Osmanli cases as well, are really nothing but loose combinations of root nouns with deictic (prepositional) elements. (2) Roumanian—remotely imitative of Finno-Ugrian types—has suffixed Lat. *illum* to form its nouns, e. g. *regul*, the king, from *regem illum*. (3) In Balto-Slavic "the new house" was at first a clear three-word group (it still is nearly so in Lithuanian): *novũ jĩ domũ*. In Old Slavic, this has become a two word group with agglutination of the demonstrative element: *novũ(j)ĩ* (*novyjĩ*) *domũ*, but in all modern Slavic languages this has become a standardized 'inflected' form (although Russian has practically retained the old spelling), which, without historical proof, could not be detected as agglutinating: Czech, *nový nového novému* etc. In Balto-Slavic, the process . . . . stopped with the adjective. But in Old Norse the development went its way somewhat similarly to the way that it may be supposed to have gone in IE.: The deictic pronoun *enn* was at first added to an adjective following its noun: *Eirekr enn rauðr* 'Eric the Red'; but soon it came to be felt as a part of the noun, not of the adjective, and thus we have the 'postpositive' article, amounting to an inflectional ending, in modern Norse: *Manden, konen, barnet*, 'the man, the woman, the child.'

"I believe then, that, according to your proof, IE. case endings were deictic elements, which became 'agglutinated' as in Finno-Ugrian; this group remained in that stage; in its later mingling with IE. languages, it reintroduced certain elements of that morphological process into them, and thus we can witness, in historical times, a repetition of a small part of the development of IE. inflection."

In modern Persian (for a reference to this fact I am indebted to Professor H. C. Tolman), *-i* (some case form of the demonstrative stem of OPersian *hya-*, see Horn, Gr. Ir. Phil. I 2 § 53*b*), as it occurs in such a turn as *pišar-i swalik* (= father-the king's), has become a virtual exponent of the subsequent genitive. One wonders, in the face of *sag-i man* (dog-the of me), whether the *ē-* of Greek *ἐμοῦ* (of me) may be the IE. deictic *e*.

In further illustration of the suffixation of the article I note Semitic *malik-u*, wherein deictic *u* functions, or is believed to function, as a nominative exponent (see reference in Bull. Univ. Texas, No. 283, § 105).

P. S.—For variation of the deictics *i* and *ū* cf. *ἐνί* (*eis*) with Sk. *ānu* (Latine, *in* c. acc.). With the epithet of Ares *Ἐνν-άλιος* (quasi Insiliens) cf. Lat. *Salii*; for *ū* cf. Sk. *anū-kāśā*. *Ἐννός* will be a back formation.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY STATION, AUSTIN, TEXAS.

## V. THE WANDERING SKULL: NEW LIGHT ON TANTRĀKHYĀNA 29

When Professor Bendall published his essay on the Tantrākhyāna,<sup>1</sup> he reported a number of tales represented in that collection by only their catch verses and a few fragmentary lines of prose. To one such story, No. 29, he gives the heading, 'A merchant finds his wife's skull on a desert shore,' and its verse reads:

Jātimātro daridrasya daśavarṣaṁ ca bandhanam  
samudramadhye maraṇaṁ punaḥ kiṁ kiṁ bhaviṣyati.

By his very birth a poor man; imprisonment for ten years;  
Death in the middle of the ocean; afterwards something  
will happen.

He adds the comment: 'This is a mere fragment of a few lines. Dr. Sergius d'Oldenburg has called my attention to the South Indian tale published by Pandit Natesa in the *Ind. Antiquary* for Sept., 1884, where the verse is nearly the same.'

In the MS. of Tantrākhyāna verses published by Hertel<sup>2</sup> there is no new light on this verse and the story to which it refers. There are a few variations in the reading of the text, jātimātro daridrasya of pāda a being replaced by jātamātro daridraś ca, and kiṁ kiṁ of pāda d by kiṁcid.

The story of Pandit Natesa which Bendall mentions is in brief as follows:<sup>3</sup>

A soothsayer, on his deathbed, recites the following Sanskrit verse as the fortune of his son Gaṅgādhara:

Janmaprabhṛti dāridryaṁ daśa varṣāṇi bandhanam  
Samudratīre maraṇaṁ kiṁcid bhogaṁ bhaviṣyati.

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, new series vol. 20 (1888), p. 465.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Pañcatantra*, p. 315, and p. 334 where he discusses this verse.

<sup>3</sup> *Indian Antiquary* 13, p. 256; also published in Natesa Sastri's *Folklore in Southern India* I, p. 9; and in his *Indian Folk-Tales*, p. 8; and in Kingacote and Natesa Sastri, *Tales of the Sun*, p. 11.

This would seem to mean, 'From birth poverty, ten years of imprisonment, death on the seashore, and then there will be some happiness.' The son sets out on a pilgrimage to Benares. On the way he rescues from a well a tiger, a snake, and a rat, all Rajas of their species, and, in spite of their warnings, a goldsmith, always considered a bad character in India. Ten years later on his return he comes to the same well. He thinks of the tiger, who at once appears and presents him with the crown of a king he has just slain. In like manner the snake and the rat come to him with tokens of their gratitude. Anxious to realize the value of the crown, he takes it to the goldsmith, who lives nearby. The latter recognizes it at once as that of the King of his own city, who has just disappeared, and basely betrays his former benefactor as the murderer. Convicted by circumstantial evidence, Gaṅgādhara is cast into prison where he would have perished of starvation but for the food brought him by the rats at the command of their Raja. Meanwhile the snakes and the tigers play havoc with the lives of the subjects of the unjust King who did not make proper investigation of Gaṅgādhara's case. Day by day the people die in large numbers, while Gaṅgādhara continually declares that if given the opportunity he can stop the ravages of the tigers and snakes. Not until ten years have passed, however, and the King's daughter is on the point of death from snakebite, is he heeded. Then, at last, he is released, and calling to him the tiger and the snake Rajas has them revive the dead. His innocence is proclaimed, and he is promised the hand of the Princess. The goldsmith is thereupon seized and is about to be punished, but Gaṅgādhara generously forgives him. Our hero now sets out for home, but unintentionally takes a road that passes by the side of the sea. Unexpectedly he meets his brother, who has come to look for him, and his joy at the encounter is so excessive that it kills him. His brother has no place to keep the corpse in this strange country, and entrusts it to Gaṇeṣa, who has a temple nearby. The god leaves it in the care of the Gaṇas, and they, like incontinent children, unable to resist a tempting delicacy, devour it.<sup>4</sup> Later when the brother asks for the body, Gaṇeṣa is unable to produce it, but he escapes the brother's taunts of untrustworthiness by restoring the dead Gaṅgādhara

<sup>4</sup> I know no parallel for this incident in Hindu fiction.



to life, and thus returns more than he received. All live happily ever afterwards. The correct interpretation of the old soothsayer's prophecy now appears. *Kimcid* in *pāda d* should be construed with *maraṇam* not with *bhogam*; and the meaning of the entire verse is: 'From birth poverty; ten years of imprisonment; by the seashore death for a little while; then there will be happiness.'<sup>5</sup>

Altho this story is built around a variant of the *śloka* that appears in *Tantrākhyāna* 29, it shows no similarity to the story of which Bendall gives us a hint when he says, 'A merchant finds his wife's skull on a desert shore.' On the contrary, it is a combination of two stories, both foreign to the *Tantrākhyāna* tale: first, the ancient and widespread tale of the Grateful Animals and the Ungrateful Man;<sup>6</sup> and, second, a story illustrating the inevitability of fate, no matter how impossible of realization its provisions may seem. This second story, which tells how the body was consumed and later restored and endowed with life, bears an incomplete resemblance to the story of *Samdhimati*, found in *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī* II 65-119, where a variant of our verse occurs. King Jayendra had a trusted minister named *Samdhimati*, whom, however, jealous courtiers persuaded him to reduce to disgrace and poverty. At this time a mysterious report spread from house to house, 'To *Samdhimati* will belong the kingdom.' When he heard this, the King threw *Samdhimati* into prison, where he remained for ten years. At this time the

<sup>5</sup> Pandit Natesa gives us to understand that this story is a folk-tale, but such is not the case. It is obvious that a story built around a Sanskrit *śloka* and a trick interpretation thereof could not have been secured from the oral tradition of a *Tamil*-speaking people. It is in reality a translation from literature as are others of Pandit Natesa's stories; for example, story No. 13 in *Kingscote* and *Natesa Sastri*, *Tales of the Sun*, which is a translation of the 16th century *Tamil* romance, the *Alakeswara Katha* (see W. A. Clouston, *A Group of Eastern Romances*, translated from the Persian, *Tamil*, and *Urdu*, Introduction, p. xxix).

<sup>6</sup> *Pūrṇabhadra's Pañcatantra* I. 9; for further references see Hertel, *Das Pañcatantra* pp. 114, 135, 269, 305, 308, 322, 343, 371, and 424; Benfey, *Pantschatantra* I, pp. 193 ff.; Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes* II, p. 106 (Chap. 17); Chavannes, *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues* I, p. 87; and my paper in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 39, p. 28.

King felt his own death approaching and was unwilling to die while Saṁdhimati was yet alive; and therefore had him impaled. When Saṁdhimati's guru (spiritual adviser), named Īśāna, heard of this, he repaired to the cemetery to perform the proper funeral rites. On arriving there he found that wolves had eaten all the flesh of the body and nothing was left but the skeleton, which he removed from the stake. As he was about to perform the funeral rites, he saw this verse written on the forehead by Vidhātṛ (Fate):<sup>7</sup>

Yāvaj jivam daridratvam daśa varṣāṇi bandhanam  
śūlasya prṣṭhe maraṇam punā rājyam bhaviṣyati.

[Rājatarāṅgiṇī II, 90.]

As long as life lasts, poverty; imprisonment for ten years;  
Death on the point of the stake; and yet there will be  
sovereignty.

Īśāna recognized that three parts of the prophecy had been fulfilled, and he anxiously watched the skeleton, feeling that the fourth would prove true also, altho just how he could not conjecture. One night he saw the cemetery filled with Yoginīs (witches), and noticing that the skeleton had been displaced by them he went, sword in hand, to investigate. There he saw the Yoginīs, intoxicated with drink and lustful for a man, provide the skeleton with flesh from their own bodies, and a *membrum virile* secured from somewhere or other. Then by magic they attracted the spirit of Saṁdhimati, which was still roaming about without having entered another body, and spent the rest of the night sporting with him. As dawn drew near Īśāna, fearing that the Yoginīs would remove the heavenly body they had given Saṁdhimati, approached with a shout, and they fled, leaving Saṁdhimati whole. This affair became known to the people, and they made Saṁdhimati king, whereby the fourth part of the prophecy came true.

While this legend is connected both by subject matter and by catch verse with that translated by Natesa, it too is not related

<sup>7</sup> In India it is believed by the Hindus that at a child's birth Vidhātṛ writes its fortune on its forehead. Another common belief is that the sutures of a person's skull indicate his fortune (see in the story quoted below).

to Tantrākhyāna 29. Hertel, however, who was apparently acquainted neither with Kalhaṇa's story nor with the story that is really attached to our verse in the Pañcatantra cycle, posits Natesa's story as that belonging to the Tantrākhyāna, and wishes to ignore the prose comment of Bendall's MS. which, he says, has resulted from the commentator's lack of familiarity with the tale—provided Bendall has not misunderstood his text. This bold assumption is quite without warrant, as I shall immediately proceed to show.

In an oral tale from the Himalayas reported by G. D. Upreti<sup>8</sup> we read as follows:

Once a Pandit found a human skull on which the under-noted inscriptions (sutures) appeared: 'This man will remain in poverty during the whole of his life, and undergo ten years of imprisonment; after this he will die on the banks of the ocean; what will become of him hereafter no one knows.'<sup>9</sup> The Pandit, who understood the divine writing, felt curious about the ultimate fate of the skull, since the other things indicated by the prophecy had already transpired and he was unable to test their accuracy by comparing them with the real events of the man's life. He kept the skull carefully in a safe, until one day his wife found it, and suspected it of being that of a co-wife who had died many years before. In a fit of jealousy she threw it into a latrine, believing that when a person's bones are thus defiled the spirit remains forever in Hell.<sup>10</sup> When this unexpected termination of the skull's history was related to the Pandit, he was convinced that the entire prophecy had been correct.

This story, says Upreti, is told to explain the proverb, 'Agre kiṁ kiṁ bhaviṣyati (In the end what will happen?).' This is apparently the reading in pāda d of the verse contained in his version, that is, the prophecy as he translates it above.

It is true that the oral version of a story is rarely of any value in determining the character of the literary versions of the same tale, but it seems in this instance that the story reported by

<sup>8</sup> Proverbs and Folklore of Kumaun and Garhwal, p. 63.

<sup>9</sup> This is almost an exact translation of the Tantrākhyāna verse.

<sup>10</sup> The fate of the skull is paralleled in a Gujarati folk-tale, Indian Antiquary 21, p. 46. I suspect this story of being a garbled and fragmentary version of that found in Upreti.

Upreti throws considerable light on that so fragmentarily preserved in the Tantrākhyāna. First of all the pure Sanskrit of the proverb which the oral story illustrates indicates that the story itself has but recently come to the folk from literature; while at the same time the prophecy of the skull's fate is so good a translation of the Tantrākhyāna verse that it seems certain we are dealing with the same verse. Further, the 'stage properties' presented to us in the remark Bendall makes concerning the Tantrākhyāna story—a merchant, his wife, a skull, and a desert shore—are almost identical with those of the oral tale.<sup>11</sup> To be sure, Bendall's brief comment would indicate a different plot from that preserved in Upreti's story, but this difference may arise from the fragmentary character and consequent obscurity of the prose lines preserved in the Tantrākhyāna text, in which case the comment would be only conjectural. Last of all, the locality in which the oral story was collected—Kumaun or Garhwal—is immediately adjacent to Nepal, the home of the Tantrākhyāna; and the literary tale can easily have passed into the popular lore without pursuing a long geographical journey.<sup>12</sup>

It is apparent, however, that Upreti's story is not complete in itself. There is a glaring deficiency in that no account is given of the adventures of the skull before it came to the Pandit. From birth a poor man, imprisonment for ten years, death on the banks of the ocean—how did these things transpire? The answer is found in the remaining version of the story to be considered, the most complete of those we have and yet lacking the verse itself. It too comes from the Pañcatantra cycle, and is found in Abbé Dubois's collection.<sup>13</sup>

A *poverty-stricken* Brahman in utter despair about to desert his family was taken into partnership by a merchant. Together

<sup>11</sup> In this story it is a Pandit, not a merchant, who finds the skull. We shall see later that he is an amalgamation of two characters of the original story—a man who finds the skull and an astrologer to whom he takes it for examination. In the oral tale there is no intimation that the skull was found on a desert shore. This omission, like that of other details, is due to faulty oral tradition.

<sup>12</sup> A vernacular text may be the immediate source of the oral tale. For Newāri prose commentaries on the Tantrākhyāna verses, see Hertel, *Das Pañcatantra*, pp. 313 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Pantcha-Tantra*, p. 24 (Introduction, story 2).



they went to a distant isle where he was left by this merchant as surety for goods which he had bought but for which he had not the cash to pay. The merchant, however, perished in a shipwreck, and never returned to redeem his pledge. The enraged creditors, thinking themselves defrauded, cast the unfortunate Brahman into *prison where he languished for ten years*, and then died. Hereupon, their vengeance not yet sated, they *threw his body into the ocean*, denying it the usual funeral rites. The body was eaten away by fish until only the skull remained. This the winds and the waves polished and filled with precious and aromatic substances, and at last threw on shore. It passed thru several hands until it came to a Rajput, who by close examination discovered that it was a skull and took it to an astrologer. The latter asserted positively that it was a skull, and advised the Rajput to throw it into the Ganges in order that he to whom it had belonged might attain to Heaven (svarga). The moral drawn is that *often matters destined for our harm result in our good fortune.*

The passages italicized represent approximately the four statements of the verse that belongs to this version, and we see now that we have here virtually the entire story.<sup>14</sup> The tale as preserved in Upreti's collection and the Tantrākhyāna prose fragments agrees with the story translated by Dubois until we reach the point where the skull is found. Here there is a lacuna in Dubois's tale in that no mention is made of the fact that the Brahman's fate was indicated on his skull and was read by the astrologer. The two different terminations of the skull's history seem to indicate two versions of the tale with correspondingly different readings of the verse. One version, represented in Upreti and the Tantrākhyāna, had an unhappy ending in which a jealous woman brought ultimate misfortune upon the owner of the skull and the last pāda of its verse probably read *punaḥ kiṁ kiṁ bhaviṣyati* (afterwards something will happen). The second version, found in Dubois, ended happily, and its verse, as we may infer from the stories of Dubois, Kalhaṇa, and Pandit

<sup>14</sup> There has been literary intercourse of an intimate nature between Southern India and Nepal. Notice, for example, the well-known close relation between the Southern version of the Pañcatantra and the corresponding collection of verses from Nepal (see Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 37).

Natesa, read in pādas c and d samudratīre maraṇam kimcid bhogaṁ bhaviṣyati (death on the seashore; then there will be some happiness).<sup>15</sup>

Each of these versions is doubtless represented in the literature of India by a text more complete than any of those discussed in this paper. As to the question of which of these versions is nearer the original from which both are ultimately derived, no answer can be made until one of these more complete texts comes to hand. It is clear, however, that the story of 'The Wandering Skull' has a fixed place in the Pañcatantra cycle.

W. NORMAN BROWN.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

---

#### A CORRECTION.

Mr. Thomas J. Wise has called my attention to an error in the article on "The Centenary of Don Juan" (AJP. XL, 2). On page 126 it is stated that "in *The Liberal* the later cantos [of Don Juan] were published." This misstatement is due to a trick of memory; John and Leigh, the publishers of *The Liberal*, in which other work by Byron appeared, published cantos v to xvi inclusive in four separate volumes. No part of the poem appeared in *The Liberal*.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

<sup>15</sup> I assume that a version of the story with a 'happy ending' is not only the source of Dubois's tale, but also the point of departure for the stories in Natesa's collection and in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. In the latter place the verse, as well as the story, has been radically changed.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Egypt Exploration Fund. Graeco-Roman Branch. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIII. Edited with Translations and Notes by BERNARD P. GRENFELL and ARTHUR S. HUNT. London, *Egypt Exploration Fund*; Boston, 503 Tremont Temple, 1919.

The thirteenth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* unlike its predecessor, which was given up to edicts, letters and documents of one sort and another, contains literary papyri only. They come from the three large finds of literary material made in 1905-6, the first of which with the issuing of this volume has now been completely published. There is much that is interesting in the new volume. One turns first of all to the fragments of the *Dithyrambs* of Pindar. Egypt has already given us portions of his *Paeans* (*Ox. P.* 841) and *Parthenia* (*Ox. P.* 659), as well as odes of an uncertain character (*Ox. P.* 408), and this volume includes also parts of *Ol.* I, II, VI and VII, the first epinician odes to be represented by papyri. The new fragment, which consists of two pieces, apparently belonged to Book I of the *Dithyrambs* and contains portions of three odes with brief scholia. The first, written for the Argives, probably had to do with the Perseus legend, but it is so mutilated that not very much can be made out of it. The same is true of the third ode which seems to have been written for the Corinthians. Of the second, however, we have the first thirty lines which can be restored almost completely. It is entitled Θρασὺς Ἡρακλῆς ἡ Κέρβερος. Θηβαίους and appears to have been famous in antiquity. Three of the extant fragments (79 *a* and *b* and 208) appear in it making the identity of the author certain, though there could have been little doubt on this point as the lines exhibit all the color and vigor of style which we associate with Pindar. The ode begins by contrasting the older with the newer form of the dithyramb to the advantage of the latter derived from the festival of Dionysus in Olympus, which the poet proceeds to describe. Then it passes on to Thebes and the ancestry of Dionysus, when the papyrus breaks off. It is clear that the new kind of dithyramb is that of Pindar, not of Lasus as Boeckh supposed from Frag. 79*a*; but the much discussed σὰν κίβδαλον of line 3 (also Frag. 79*a*) does seem to refer to the ῥῥδαὶ ἀσιγμοὶ of Lasus, as Athenaeus says. Enough of the ode remains to show that it was a brilliant one and it is a pity that it is not complete. It is written in dactylo-epitritic metre and was

arranged in strophes and probably in triads as the first was. The fact that Dionysus is referred to in all three odes has some bearing on the history of the dithyramb. Two new words occur, *εἰάμπυξ* in I 13 and *ἀκναμπτεῖ* in III 12. The papyrus dates from the latter part of the second century A. D.

The fragment of the *Olympian Odes* is a sheet of two leaves and contains *Ol.* I 106–II 45 and VI 71–VII 20. Two of its four columns are fairly well preserved. This papyrus probably dates from the fifth century and its text is very close to that of our best manuscripts, sometimes agreeing with the Ambrosian family, but more often with the Vatican. The difficulty in *Ol.* II 6 and the interpolation *φλέοντι δὲ Μοῖσαι* in *Ol.* II 29–30 both recur. In II 39 the new reading *πατρώϊαν* must be wrong, and Mr. E. Lobel's emendation to *πατρώϊ' ἄν*, the *ἄν* belonging to *ἔχων*, may well be correct. In VI 77 *ὄρος* is found in place of *ὄροισ* or *ὄροις* of the manuscripts.

Next in importance to the Pindar come the prose fragments. About two hundred small pieces belonged to a roll which once contained six of the lost speeches of Lysias. The longest fragment has the last three columns of a speech *Πρὸς Ἱπποθέρσην ὑπὲρ θεραπαίνης* and two columns of a speech against a certain Theomnestus. Two orations against Theomnestus are extant, but they seem to refer to a different person. The speech against Hippothereses was evidently an important one and had to do with the restoration of the property of Lysias after his return from exile. Lysias must have been the real plaintiff in the case. Apparently an estate of his valued at seventy (?) talents had been confiscated by the Thirty and sold to Hippothereses and others. In the peroration Lysias points out how devotedly he had served the state in contrast with his opponent who had long been allied with the enemies of Athens. This papyrus dates from the end of the second or beginning of the third century A. D.

Another orator is represented by parts of ten columns devoted to the defense of a man named Lycophron on a charge of adultery. It is probably the work of Hyperides who is known to have defended Lycophron, but it is a different speech from the one partly preserved in the British Museum. Only about one hundred lines can be restored.

Still another papyrus contains portions of the *Alcibiades* of Aeschines Socraticus. The continuous passages are short, the longest having less than twenty lines, but they are sufficient to show that Aeschines in the portrait which he drew of Socrates was in close agreement with Plato in his earlier dialogues.

Another group of sixty or more small pieces belonged to an important historical work. With the help of Diodorus about one hundred lines have been restored. They fall into three groups one of which has to do with Themistocles, the second



with Cimon's operations against the Persians, and the third with the plot of Artabanus to kill Xerxes and seize the throne. The author was evidently one of the main sources of Diodorus, who often follows him very closely, and the editors feel that there can be little doubt that he was Ephorus and that this is part of his twelfth book. This papyrus is likely to revive the controversy as to the authorship of *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, variously ascribed to Cratippus, Theopompus or Ephorus. It appears to favor Ephorus.

Another papyrus has about 130 lines of a lost work on literary criticism. In one small piece there is a discussion of the number of judges in comic contests; another longer fragment tells the story of Caeneus, king of the Lapithae, and perhaps formed part of a discussion of the Middle Comedy; in a third piece the different men named Thucydides are discussed; while a fourth has to do with the authorship of the famous ode to Pallas (cf. Arist. *Clouds* 967), and appears to favor Lamprocles. The evidence for the authorship of this interesting work is set forth in some detail, but no satisfactory conclusion is reached.

Still another prose fragment, of which about forty lines are fairly well preserved, belonged to an oration on the cult of a Roman emperor who is called simply Caesar. Another is a list of the early Athenian archons from Ariphron to Apsandrus. The beginnings of twenty-seven lines of the *Μισοῦμενος* of Menander are also included in this volume, but they are of little value because of their meagreness.

Of the fragments of extant works the most interesting are parts of Theocritus, *Idyls* V, VII and XV, dating from the fifth century. The text does not agree with the existing families of manuscripts, but the editors think it as good as that of K. There are several important new readings in XV, e. g. *πέρνουν* in line 98 for the corrupt *σπέρχιν* or *πέρχην* of the manuscripts, thus confirming Reiske's conjecture; *ὄχλος ἀλαθέως*, line 72, for various corrupt manuscript readings; and *μὴ ἀποπλαγχθῆς*, line 67. The order in which the idyls are found is also interesting. In this connection it may be observed that the important codex of Theocritus found by J. de M. Johnson at Antinoë is soon to be published and will no doubt shed much welcome light on the problems of the text.

A small piece of the *Ajax* of Sophocles (ll. 694-705 and 753-764) with the variants *Μύσια* in 699 and *τὴνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν* in 756; and the first fifty-six lines of the *Plutus* of Aristophanes represent plays of which no papyrus fragments have previously been found. Parts of *Orestes* 53-61 and 89-97, of Herodotus III, of Thucydides I, II and III, of Plato's *Protagoras* and of Aeschines *Against Ctesiphon* complete the list of extant texts. There are also published several theological fragments including part of a new recension of *Tobit* XII.

The volume is edited with the usual care, and acknowledgment is made to various scholars for their assistance. Professor Hunt has had less to do with this than with the earlier volumes because of his absence on military duties, but the high standard of former years is fully maintained. The restorations proposed are always plausible and often certain; but the possibilities have by no means been exhausted, and there is abundant opportunity for those whose skill lies in restoring texts. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XIII is an important contribution and will be welcomed by all who are interested in the study of Greek literature.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

---

Everyday Greek—Greek Words in English, Including Scientific Terms. By HORACE ADDISON HOFFMAN. viii + 107 pp. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1919. \$1.25 net; postpaid, \$1.35.

In setting forth the scope and the purpose of this work, Dr. HOFFMAN states that the book has grown out of his own needs "in giving a brief course in the derivation of English words of Greek origin." He expresses the hope "that it will also be of service to many other teachers in giving similar courses in colleges and high schools," and he believes that "many persons will find such a manual very helpful for private study and reference." For the latter purpose, he has in mind two classes of students: "those who have studied Greek in the usual way," who, he thinks, "will find the book helpful for purposes of review and in the application of their knowledge to the study of Greek words in English"; and those who may "use the book in private study as the means of acquiring in the shortest and most direct way a sufficient knowledge of Greek to enable them to trace the origin and feel the force of scientific terms and other English words of Greek origin." The author remarks upon the great difficulty he has experienced in deciding what to include in the manual and what to omit, and feels sceptical about his ability to satisfy everyone by his selections. With regard to the manner of treatment, we are informed that the endeavor has been to "present the material in the most convenient and practical form rather than in a scientific and exhaustive form."

Dr. HOFFMAN has evidently bestowed much thought and care on his work, and, within the limits he has prescribed for himself, he has successfully accomplished his task. The work consists of six parts: (1) The Alphabet. (2) Parts of Speech. (3) Formation of Words. (4) Word Groups for Study. (5) Vocabulary. (6) Index and Key to Derivation. Of serious errors, save

those of Greek accent, there seems to be but a very small number. The most grievous error is the derivation (pp. 43, 66, 96) of the word "archives" from ἀρχαῖα instead of from ἀρχεῖα > Lat. archi(v)a > Fr. archives. "Plague" is not a derivative of πλῆγή (84, 104) but of a cognate of πλῆγή. "Crypt" comes from Latin crypta = Greek κρυπτή, rather than from κρυπτόν (77). ἀναισθησία is not an "action noun" in -σία (ἀν-αισθη-σία, p. 28), but a "quality noun" in -ια from ἀναίσθητος. "Apothecary" (65) has been curiously substituted for "apothecary's shop," and "Cato" and "Cicero" have somehow or other slipped in among the examples of Greek derivatives (12). Apropos of the remark on αἰλός (52), it should be noted that αἰλός is used also in a non-musical sense. It is a slip to say (56) that ἤλεκτρον "is used in modern science to designate electricity" — "electro-," as a combining form, is so used. The adjectival form in -ous is several times inadvertently used for the substantival form in -us: polypous (16), phosphorous (18, 93, 104). It is an oversight to say (51) that παράδοξος as a noun means "paradox" — the neuter of παράδοξος was meant. Active σκήπτω hardly means "prop one's self" (86); the singular νεφρός does not mean the plural "kidneys" (81); πυώω (act.) does not mean to "suppurate" (85), but "cause to suppurate;" πυρή (85, 105) should be πυρά; the ε of διοίκεσις (70) should be replaced by η; and the asterisk should be supplied with the following words, which do not occur in L. and S.: ἀγνωστικός, ἀκροβάτης, γαστρικός, γιγαντικός, διάγνωνος, ἐκκεντρικός, μεταλλουργός, παρενθετικός. The printer's devil is no doubt to be blamed for such slips as ψῆς (8, for ψῆ), ἐχειρίδιον (10), cranebill (68), cuttng (73), ζῶον (84, for ζῶον), ἐν (91, for ἐν), φιλανθρωπία (92, for φιλανθρωπία), καθέδρα (97, for καθέδρα), ichthyohagous (101); and the electrotypist probably planed away the accents of λεγω (64), ἵπο (91, 101), ἀνα (95), and the iota subscript of ᾠδή (14); but the evil one himself must have sown the following crop of faulty accents: χόρος (11, for χορός), γενέα (14, for γενεά), ποῦς (16, 85, 96 bis, 104, 105, for πούς), νέφρος (27, 34 for νεφρός), ἀστρο-νόμ-ος (41, line 11, for ἀστρο-νόμ-ος), Εὐγενής (61, for Εὐγένης), ζύγον (64, for ζυγόν), ἀκροβατής (64, 95, for ἀκροβάτης), πτέρον (66, 85, 96, 97, 98, 101, 103, for πτερόν), διαβόλος (70, for διάβολος), δίπλοος (70, for διπλόος), ἔλεφας (72, 99, for ἐλέφας), θῶραξ (75, 106 bis, for θώραξ), κράσις (77, 97, for κρᾶσις), μύελος (80, 102 ter, 104, for μυελός), ῥινοκέρω (86, 105, for ῥινόκερω), δρύς (98, for δρῦς), δήμος (99, for δῆμος), λύσις (100, for λύσις), and ζωνή (107, for ζώνη).

The following remarks are intended not as criticisms, but as suggestions, some of which the author may, perhaps, see his way clear to adopt in a future edition, which, I hope, will soon become necessary. It is desirable in the interest of sound scholar-

ship that the section on Greek accents be revised. To say that "in pronouncing Greek words we accent the syllable over which the accent is placed and make no distinction with regard to the kind of accent mark used," may represent the prevailing practice, but it does not represent the ancient practice, and the student is entitled to know the theory of ancient practice (see Smyth's Greek Grammar, § 130). Whether the teacher or the student is able to make the distinctions, or cares to make them, matters not. It is also important that the student be acquainted with the general rules for the position of the Greek accent, and that the quantity of the vowels *ι*, *α* and *υ* be marked when it is long. In the exercise on p. 12, the student is asked to pronounce among other words the Greek and the Latinized English forms of Σωκράτης, Θουκυδίδης, Ἀφροδίτη, Εὐριπίδης, Αἰσχύλος. He will not be able to pronounce correctly a single one of these words, either in Greek or in English, without a knowledge of the quantities, and it is surely asking too much of him to consult a Greek lexicon for information which might have been given with so little extra trouble. In view of the divergence of Greek and English, a section on the syllabification of Greek words would form a valuable addition. The usefulness of the book would be further enhanced by uniformity in the employment of full-faced type in the printing of English derivatives, and the student would surely be grateful for the giving of the genders and of the genitive case of the substantives in the Vocabulary. It would be conducive to a much better understanding of many of the Greek derivatives, if something were said about the rôle of French as a vehicle of transmission of the Greek. It would shed a flood of light on much that would otherwise remain obscure—and it would not be at all inconsistent with a popular method of presentation—to follow the example of our large English dictionaries and to indicate the successive media of transmission, if ever so briefly. So, for example, *archives* < F < L < ἀρχεῖα (or, F L ἀρχεῖα); *bishop* < AS < L < ἐπίσκοπος (or, AS L ἐπίσκοπος); *hour* < F < L < ὥρα (or, F L ὥρα). But the thing which is uppermost in my mind, and which I most earnestly commend to the author's consideration, is the question of the desirability of extending the limits of his treatise so as to include all the "everyday Greek" and the nucleus, at least, of all the scientific Greek. When one reads in the Index the word "amphioxus," one sorely misses such words as abyss, academy, achromatic, acolyte, acrostic, adamant, allegory, alphabet, amazon, amnesty, amphibious, amphibrach, anachronism, anagram, anchorite, anthracite, apocalypse, apoplexy, aphelion, aphorism, apotheosis, archipelago, aroma, asparagus, asphalt, asphyxia, autonomy—to mention only words beginning with the first letter of the alphabet.



Before closing this notice, I wish once more to state that, within the limits set for himself, the author has produced a good book. It seems to meet a wide-felt want, and I believe it will in large measure fulfill the purposes for which it was intended. I hope, however, that the author will regard it as only a beginning, and that he will in the future revise and augment it so as greatly to enlarge its sphere of usefulness and to make it a real *vademecum* for all those who, in one way or another, are interested in the Greek element of English.

C. W. E. MILLER.

---

THE NEW PAULY REAL-ENCYCLOPÄDIE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Urbana, Nov. 10, 1919.

I received this morning in the mail a letter from Professor W. Kroll of Breslau telling of the extremely sad state of affairs now obtaining in Germany and the extraordinary difficulties with which they have to contend in order to maintain any of their scientific enterprises. In particular, he informs me that the great revision of the Pauly Realencyclopädie, which he has kept going only with extreme sacrifice, will now certainly collapse unless they can count upon the speedy renewal of subscriptions in foreign countries, so that at least as many copies as were taken before the war will be subscribed for again. It would be a terrible loss to scholarship if this monumental enterprise should be given up now, and I wonder if it would not be appropriate for you in the columns of the *American Journal of Philology* to call attention to the situation. . . . I should think that a number of scholars in this country might well order the work for themselves as well as see to it that the libraries with which they are connected resume promptly their subscriptions. I have heard indirectly that the . . . has already gone under. I hope that is not true, but surely we ought not now to let the new Pauly Realencyclopädie collapse. . . .

W. A. OLDFATHER.

## REPORTS

PHILOLOGUS, Band LXXV (N. F. Bd. XXIX) (1919), Heft 1 and 2.

Pp. 1-67. C. Ritter, Platons Logik. (To be continued later.) This treatise was written some years ago. As originally planned it kept close to the latest dialogues (Parmenides, Sophistes, Politikos, Philebos, Timaios and Nomoi) touching incidentally on the Menon, Phaidon, and Theaitetos. Though the collection of materials is not complete, many sections have been worked over. 1. In opposition to the Eleatics Plato maintained that every logician must presuppose thinking and its actuality before he can lay down rules for it with his law of identity. He finds that judgment (λόγος) is the form in which actual thinking expresses itself. Insight into the nature of judgment must also make clear the meaning of the laws valid for judgment or thought. While Plato did not bring into vogue a formula for the law of identity, which he has made into an instrument of knowledge, from what he says about the so-called law of contrast, its positive counterpart can be easily restored. The rule of the excluded third can be derived from Sophistes 250d. 2. The concept of being and the nature of judgment. (Soph. 244d.) 3. The categories (and negative definition). As set forth in the Sophistes it would seem as if the three pairs of concepts—being and not-being, identity and difference, motion and rest—were arbitrarily selected as examples of comprehensive general concepts. But Plato seems to picture his system of concepts as resembling a triangle of broad base and tapering to a point. He was aware of other categories. In another connection, Philebos 23c ff., he takes the position that as every category as such is applicable to the most diverse content we can say of it that which serves Philebos as the distinguishing mark of the unlimited, that it includes in itself the greater and the less. So the individual category is a species of the unlimited. The unlimited is a supreme general concept, under which all the categories, μέγιστα γένη, fall. 4. The dialectic method of determining concepts. Collect under a comprehensive general concept all phenomena that belong together; then the eye will be struck by special differences, which in turn give the criteria for the division of the general concept into groups. 5. The basis of a concept-system. In spite of the limits of man's knowledge and experience, certain adequate definitions can be made; hence τέχνη or ἐπιστήμη can be sub-

mitted to systematic classification. 6. Special rules of concept-formation, based on the Sophistes and Politikos. A. Seven rules are given for division: dichotomy; choose the differentia so as to obtain things logically alike; the division should be natural; not far-fetched or by sudden steps; the process should go on until the end sought is obtained. B. The chief rule for grouping individual phenomena under general concepts is that one must not be deceived by anything non-essential; but Plato states no simple criterion for what is important and essential, yet one may be discerned when a concept is examined from the point of view of its purpose or end, and judged on that basis. 7. The Platonic determination of concepts compared with Aristotle's syllogistic. All the rules of the syllogism might be deduced from the argumentation or the preliminaries to definition in the Platonic dialogues. 8. Naming and the formula of definition. Concepts which in important respects are contrasted ought necessarily to be so subdivided that this relation is made clear. The parts should be named. Examples of the formula of definition, λόγος τοῦ ὀνόματος, are found in Soph. 223 b and 224 d.

Pp. 68-76. W. Kroll, ἐν ᾗθει. For the use of this phrase in the writers on rhetoric and music much material has been collected by Süß and Abert. But ᾗθος and ἐν ᾗθει are terms used with some confusion by the grammarians whom we know from the scholia. Rutherford in "A Chapter in the History of Annotation," p. 126, treats of this usage at some length; his explanation is correct, but his data are incomplete as he considers only the Greek scholia on the drama. *Ethos*, besides denoting a uniform and abiding 'character,' may also be used for *pathos*. The two have this in common, that ᾗθος denotes the expression with which something is spoken and which reveals a character or mood (Stimmung). More frequent are passages where ᾗθος, without any qualification, means 'emphasis.' Most frequently the word denotes 'irony,' but this use is developed from the preceding and implies 'emphasis.' In other passages the meaning 'character' is still preserved. To complete the confusion, the term is also used to denote what belongs to the sphere of moral philosophy. Considerable material is collected for Donatus and the Homeric scholia.

Pp. 77-96. G. Helmreich, Zu Galen. 1. Critical notes. The text of Galen has been sadly neglected in the last century. For the new Corpus Medicorum the text should be carefully revised. As examples of the corruption of the text in the last edition, that of Kühn (Leipzig, 1821-1833), a number of passages from the pharmacological works (vols. 12-13, Kühn) are examined and intelligible readings restored. 2. Lexicographical. Owing to the corrupt state of the text there is danger that 'ghost words'

may be added to our lexicons. But many legitimate words found in Galen are not in Passow's lexicon; other words are cited there as only from authors of a later period, and others are given without citation of authority. An examination of vols. 12-13 gives 65 new words; 47 more cited by Passow only from later authors; and 10 cited by him without mention of the author.

Pp. 98-127. A. Ludwich, Ueber die Homerischen Glossen Apions. (Conclusion, cf. vol. LXXIV, pp. 205 ff.) The purpose of this article is to estimate the value of the not inconsiderable remains of Apion's Homeric glossary. But before this can be adequately accomplished the whole body of manuscript material must be published. The labors of the ancients in the field of Homeric semasiology offer a field broad enough to appall even an indefatigable philologist; yet the work is well worth doing and indispensable for the study of the lexicons and scholia that have come down to us, promising rich returns for the whole field of philological science in antiquity.

Apion's glossary was freely excerpted by Apollonius the Sophist. It was not restricted to words of various meanings. It was limited to the two great epics and arranged in alphabetical order according to the initial letters of the words; it was careless of Homeric inflexional forms in citing words in the lemmata; it often failed to discriminate between peculiarities of dialect, spelling and pronunciation; simple and compound words were separated without any plan; there was a constant striving to discover meanings and etymologies; citations were often 'contaminated'; there was an admixture of things un-Homeric. An examination of the passages, which some think point to the spuriousness of the glossary, shows nothing more than the possibility of corruption and mutation resulting from excerption.

Pp. 128-133. Fr. Vollmer. Nachträge zur Ausgabe von Q. Sereni liber medicinalis. The author describes two additional MSS to which Dr. Lehmann had called his attention: Vat. Pal. Lat. 1088, Saec. IX (fol. 66-68v) and Bonn. Univ. Bibl. MS. 218, Saec. XI (fol. 72-81v). The former is a good representative of the more corrupt B tradition; the latter is a mixed codex, its original being of Class B, but with additions from Class A. Cod. Hertensis N. 192, Saec. XI (at Schloss Herten in Westphalia) described by Sudhoff in Archiv f. Geschichte d. Medizin, X, 265-313, also contains a mixed tradition, a corrupt form of Class B, added to and corrected in some passages from Class A. Selected readings are given from these manuscripts. The better text of the A class was all but forgotten in the Middle Ages. A trace of it is to be found in a Leiden MS, which contains a poem by Jacobus, elsewhere preserved only in the Zürich MS containing the A tradition of Serenus. Finally Vollmer



solves the riddle mustro = vespertilio; mustro is O. H. G.: *fledaremustro* (fledermaus).

Pp. 134-155. R. Foerster, *Platons Phaidros und Apulejus*. Certain passages in the *Phaidros* (251 c sq.; cf. *Metamorph.* IV 28 sq.) point to some sort of Platonic influence on Apuleius' fable of Cupid and Psyche. Was it direct or indirect? The description of the *ψυχή* in *Phaidros* 246 *ἐπτερωμένη μετεωροπορεῖ* and *πεπορησάσα φέρεται*, and in 248 c *θεῶ ξυνοπαδὸς γενομένη*, and in 249 c *συμπορευθεῖσα θεῶ* led some artist to create an Eros and Psyche group, probably an important work of art, and much copied in the smaller forms of which we have examples. The Hellenistic source of Apuleius' Milesian tale was influenced by this artist's work, which was in turn inspired by the *Phaidros*. We know of no artistic representation of Eros and Psyche before the date of the *Phaidros*, even if the latter was a work of Plato's old age. Most of Foerster's argument is in refutation of the assumptions of Reitzenstein, who supposed a Hellenistic modification of an oriental (Iranian) myth. When Reitzenstein sees in the deification of Psyche through Eros a trace of direct Platonic influence on the Alexandrian version of the myth, Foerster agrees, but beyond that he will not follow him.

Pp. 156-177. M. Boas, *Neue Catobrichstücke. II.* (Conclusion. Cf. vol. LXXIV, 313-351.) The Cato fragment in Cod. Monac. 19413, saec. XI: *Rumori ne crede novo nec ficta loquendo | Laeteris: nocuit cunctis audacia semper*. We also can derive a fragment of another lost distich which became contaminated with IV 39: *Cede locum laesus, fortunae cede potenti Laedere quae potuit et in ipso tempore donis*. The form of II 2 in Monac. and Medic. (belonging to the Φ tradition) involving a difficult critical question may be determined. The original form is: *mitte arcana dei caelumque inquirere quid sit*, etc. (Cf. the beginning of Lactantius *divin. instit.* I 1, 3.) It is not a Christian modification of a pagan thought (an *di sint caelumque regant ne quaere doceri*, given in cod. Turicensis). Like others of the distichs it shows that their author was a Christian, but that he was still infected with pagan beliefs.

Pp. 178-182. J. Czebe, *Zu Diog. Laert. III 28 und Alkiphron IV 7*. The fragment of Amphis in D. L. has not the slightest connection with the epistle of Alkiphron. Hence C. Ritter's emendation (*Philol.* 68, 334) of *ὥσπερ κοχλίας* to *ὕπὲρ κροτάφους* is unnecessary. The reference is not to the snail-shell but to the snail itself (*helix arbustorum*, L.), whose extended horns might resemble lifted eyebrows. The epistle of Alkiphron goes back to Lukian, *Bis Acc.* § 28, p. 826 R., *Hermot.* § 1, p. 739; *Nigr.* §§ 1-2.

Pp. 183-201. H. Kern, *Der antike Astyanax-Mythus und seine späteren Auswüchse*. In the seventeenth century the house of Bourbon called themselves Hectoridae and Troiugeneae, claiming that Astyanax was their ancestor. But in antiquity Astyanax had a tragic fate. The myth was developed from Homer (Il. VI 476 f. and XXIV 734 f.) by the cyclic epic which is now lost, but whose influence is traceable in wall-painting and vase-painting, especially of the fifth century; also in the mythographic poetry of the Alexandrian era, which revived the epic for a short, shadowy existence; in the mythological prose excerpts which accompanied it; and in Pausanias. From these sources seven versions may be established: Astyanax grew up; his mother endeavored to protect him; the Greeks sought to extirpate the house of Priam and wreak vengeance on Hector by slaying his son; Astyanax himself leaped from a high tower; Neoptolemus with his own hand slew him; Odysseus slew him in execution of a decree of the Achaeans; he met his death with Priam at the altar of Zeus. The Attic drama presents no modification of the myth. Roman tragedy follows in the footsteps of the Greek, although Seneca (Troades) makes Andromache hide her child in the tomb of Hector, and, later in the play, Astyanax throws himself from the tower. Based on ancient tradition, and strongly influenced by Seneca, but still unaffected by the later form of the myth, is a humanistic epic 'Astyanax' by Maffeo Vegio, of the fifteenth century, in 317 verses. II. The romance of Troy by Benoît de Sainte-Maure was based on Dares and Dictys. The second part following Dictys makes Astyanax with Laodamas his brother remain alive after Hector's death in the new home of Neoptolemus and Andromache. Strabo XIII 52 and Stephanus of Byzantium include Astyanax (Skamandrios) among the emigrant settlers from Troy. The scholiast on Lykophron states that Remus and Romulus with the sons of Hector, Astyanax and Sapernios, founded Rome. The Burgundian chronicler Fredegar makes Priam the first king of the Franks, and mentions as a descendant of Priam a later leader Francio, who was identified with Astyanax by succeeding generations which were ever on the lookout for something sensational. Upon this bizarre foundation Pierre Ronsard in 1572 built his epic, 'Franciade'; while Racine in the second preface to his edition (1676) of the 'Andromaque' admits that he was obliged to let Astyanax live "un peu plus qu'il n'a vécu," and adds: "Qui ne sait que l'on fait descendre nos anciens rois du fils d'Hector?"

Pp. 202-226. E. Hoppe, *Ist Heron der Verfasser der unter seinem Namen herausgegebenen Definitionen und der Geometrie?* Heron, neither directly nor indirectly, had anything to do with the "Definitions." They originated, at the earliest,

towards the end of the sixth century, from lecture notes taken from a teacher who dealt with commentaries more than with originals. They circulated under Heron's name, as Heron's mensuration was the traditional basis for all surveying. The case is similar for the geometry, which has no mathematical value, but is historically interesting as it shows the depths to which Greek mathematics had fallen in the seventh and eighth centuries.

Pp. 227-243. Miscellen.—1. pp. 227-231. G. Thiele, Zur Libyschen Fabel. (Supplement to the author's article on λόγοι Λιβυκοί in Neue Jahrb. XXI 6.) Two discourses of the imperial era, Or. V by Dion of Prusa and Lucian's *περὶ διαδάδων*, both of the type called *λαλιαί* or *προλαλιαί*, show the continuance of the tradition of the λόγοι Λιβυκοί. These later pieces show rhetorical elaboration of the fable with the addition of many details of landscape. These fables were derived by the Sophists from the Cynic literature. Dion's Or. V is complete in itself, a *παίγνιον* which might have served as a *προλαλιά*; or, as in Or. IV, as an insertion; or as a conclusion. The earliest trace of the Libyan fable points to a time before Aeschylus, whose 'dying eagle' (Myrmidon., fr. 139) utters words like those of the trees in the fable of the trees and the woodchoppers. If the Syrian romance of Achibar was not influenced by the Libyan fables its date must go back as far as the fifth century.—2. pp. 231-232. N. A. Bees, Zu einer Randnotiz der Pausaniashandschrift Va. The corrected reading in a marginal note to Paus. VII 18, 2 (cod. Vindob. Hist. Graec. XXIII) mentions Kamenitza near Patras, wrongly identifying it with Olenos. The ultimate source of the note cannot be determined.—3. pp. 232-237. W. Soltan, Zur römischen Verfassungsgeschichte. (Zur *lex centuriata de imperio*.) Immediately after their accession to office, which took place at once after their election, the censors assumed their dignity on the Campus Martius, with sacrifices and auspices, and by solemnly taking their official seat. They then held their first *contio*. Neither immediately nor soon after their accession was there time enough for a new summons of the *comitia centuriata*. From Varro (L. L. VI 86 f.) it is clear that the censor needed the *imperium* only for the purpose of reconvening the *comitia centuriata*. After the decree of the people, after the new determination of the *exercitus*, after the *lustratio*, he was obliged to dismiss the *comitia*, and lead the *exercitus urbanus* "ad vexillum" for the levy. As a corollary to this it is to be inferred that the centuries of the *comitia centuriata* must have been drawn up in ranks according to the arrangement of the reformed constitution.—4. p. 237. H. Krause, Zu Pind. Pyth. I. Read *θέλγεις* for *θέλγει* and then *κῆλα* as object in its natural meaning.—5. pp. 237-242. R.

Pfeiffer, *Antikes in der Zimmerischen Chronik* (cf. *Philol.* LXXIV 131-183). The 16th cent. author of the chronicle of the Zimmern family knew no Greek. His chief helper was probably Hieronymus Boner, who in 1534 dedicated a German translation of Plutarch to Wilhelm Werner von Zimmern.—6. pp. 242-243. A. Semenov, *Noch einmal die "Ilias in nuce."* Against Gardthausen the writer insists that Pliny's reference (*N. H.* 7, 21, 85) to a miniature Iliad that could be put in a nut-shell is based on a misunderstanding. Cicero or his authority took the supposed original *ἐν κορύμῳ* as 'nut' when it meant a 'box made of the wood of a nut-tree.'

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XLII (1918), parts 1, 2.

Pp. 5-27. Essay on Sallust's *Catiline*. Ragnar Ullmann. The writer sees the influence of the Greek drama on the composition of Sallust's monograph. Setting aside the brief philosophical introduction (1-4), we have the prologue (5-16), the *parodos* (17-19), the first episode (20-30), the first *stasimon* (31, 1-4), the second episode (31, 5-36, 3), the second *stasimon* (36, 4-39, 5), the third episode (39, 6-53, 1), the third *stasimon* (52, 2-54), the *exodos* (55-61). In its psychological analysis the model is Thucydides. The style is largely due to a desire to avoid the manner of Cicero.

Pp. 28-31. Note on the epitaph of Abercius. L. Saint-Paul.

Pp. 32-41. Emendations to the Greek tragic poets. J. E. Harry. Textual notes on Aeschylus, *Supplices*, 186; *Persae*, 815, 304, 539, 562; *Choephoroi*, 224, 544; *Eumenides* 203, 213, 925; Sophocles, *Electra*, 451; Oedipus *Coloneus*, 694-706, 1074-1084, 1192, 1373, 1447-1456, 1670-1695; *Trachiniae*, 186-190, 678; Euripides, *Iphigenia Aulidensis*, 1193.

Pp. 42-51. *Homère et Bacchylide dans les papyrus d'Oxyrhynchus*. Paul Collart. (1) Discussion of a fragment of the Iliad published in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XI, no. 1391. (2) Comparison of two fragmentary *skolia* of Bacchylides with the 'dedicated' *skolia* of Pindar.

Pp. 52-54. Un fragment de critique d'art dans Suidas? F. Préchac. The last sentence in the article on Sebastianos is due to a confusion of names: "le général avait un homonyme qui était une statue."

Pp. 55-59. Aristote, *Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων*, 62, 2. Paul Foucart. Perhaps the passage should read: *Τοῖς δὲ πρωτανεύουσιν εἰς σίτησιν ὀβολὸς προστίθεται, [τῷ δ' ἐπιστάτῃ] δέκα προστίθενται.*



Pp. 60-62. Un héros Éphésien. Paul Foucart. The hero Heropythos mentioned in an early inscription is probably the Heropythos mentioned by Arrian, I 17, 11.

Pp. 63-79. Écrits hermétiques. Franz Cumont. I. Sur les douze lieux de la sphère. Notes on a treatise of Hermes Trismegistus which had great influence on Roman and mediæval astrology.

P. 80. Review of R. C. Kukulá's edition of Pliny's Epistles, Leipzig, 1912. Paul Lejay.

Revue des Comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique, parus en 1914. 126 pp.

Pp. 81-84. *Proprius*, terme rituel. Louis Havet. In the long inscription which refers to the secular games of the year B. C. 17, the word *proprium*, line 103, probably means a steer which had just been fed. In Plautus, *Captivi*, 862, it seems to mean a sucking lamb.

Pp. 85-108. Écrits hermétiques, II. Le médecin Thessalus et les plantes astrales d'Hermès Trismégiste. Franz Cumont. The letter of 'Harpocraton' published in the *Revue de Philologie*, II (1878), 65-77, should be ascribed to Thessalus of Tralles (Pliny, N. H. XXIX 4, 9). It was dedicated either to Claudius or to Nero, between 43 and 68.

Pp. 109-121. La date d'avènement de Ptolémée IV Philopator. Maurice Badolle. The evidence of the papyri, combined with that of Polybius, fixes the date as September 221.

Pp. 122-129. Isocrate et Thucydide. Georges Mathieu. A list of facts and of general ideas which the later writer borrowed from the earlier. These are sometimes obscured by reason of their different conceptions of literary composition.

Pp. 130-132. Reviews of R. Dussaud, *Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la mer Égée*, and of Washington University Studies, vol. V, no. I.

Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. 64 pp.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The recent death of the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, tempts me to commit to *Brief Mention* an unpublished fragment of my memoirs. Memoirs are notoriously inaccurate, especially in matters of date. And no wonder, for it is usually the ancient of days that write memoirs. In my long experience, days, months and years run into each other with sad blending of colors, but one year stands out in my memory as an "Annus Mirabilis." It was the birth-year of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, the year in which I was sent to Europe on a special mission. Ostensibly the object of that mission was threefold. I was to seek contributions to the newly founded JOURNAL, to open negotiations with certain distinguished European professors in the hope of securing their services for the Johns Hopkins University and finally, perhaps chiefly, to form personal and professional relations with the representatives of my own line of study.<sup>1</sup>

The first stage of my journey was Trinity College, Dublin. I brought letters of introduction from my colleague, Professor Sylvester, to two of his friends, Salmon, then, if I remember right, Provost of Trinity, and Mahaffy, Professor of Ancient History, in whose death the world of letters has lost one of its most attractive personalities. Dr. Salmon, eminent both as mathematician and theologian, showed me every kindness and I owe to him one unforgettable evening in hall, enlivened by sallies of wit and gay anecdotes such as were to be expected from a company of brilliant Irish scholars. Some weeks afterwards, I met Dr. Salmon again at Cambridge, where he was to deliver one of the great sermons of the year. The subject was, I believe, "The Office of the Holy Ghost," and I remember distinctly that I was much impressed with the breadth and depth of his presentation. When I went forward after the sermon to express my pleasure at meeting him again and my appreciation of his discourse, he forestalled me by saying: "I hope you got here in time to see the Bump race." I had seen the Bump race—nothing less inspiring to one who was not initiated than that form of sport—but the question was characteristic of the college-bred English clergyman. I was afterwards to witness the far more

<sup>1</sup> I took notes of my trip, notes which are now more or less illegible, but of the so-called mission, no report was made or indeed expected, for as I subsequently ascertained, the whole business was a device to give me a holiday and incidentally an opportunity to make or renew acquaintance with foreign philological notables. The plan was one of Mr. Gilman's countless benevolences.

stirring race at Henley. There is vividly present to my mind the image of one English curate, speeding along the bank, his long coat-tails flying behind him while he shouted: "Hurrah for Jesus <College>!"

I called on Mahaffy at his rooms in Trinity, but I was informed by his servitress that Mr. Mahaffy was umpiring a cricket game. The next day was Sunday. I went to service in the Cathedral, and read with unfeigned emotion the famous 'saeva indignatio' epitaph of Dean Swift, whose works were the joy of my boyhood. Time was hanging rather heavy on my hands, and so I went down to Kingston in order to enjoy the afternoon Sunday parade and feast my eyes (not so aged then) on the pretty Irish girls with their raven locks and bright blue eyes. As I was sitting in rather forlorn mood at dinner in the Shelbourne Hotel, a waiter handed me a note from Mahaffy with an invitation to dinner that very evening. The note had been belated in its delivery, and, immediately after I had finished my meal, I mounted a jaunting-car, and hastened to Mahaffy's house in order to make due apologies. The hearty anathemas pronounced on the remissness of the hotel people warmed my heart and set me at my ease. "The great feature of the dinner," he said, "was a salmon of my own catch." He was sitting in his dining-room when I arrived, and pointed with pride to a row of silver cups which he had won at various shooting-matches. He had previously expressed his disappointment at my failure to receive his note in due time because he had wished me to hear his performance as precentor in Trinity Chapel. The next day, as we were walking along the arcade of Trinity, he was stopped by a collegian who consulted him as to a difficult question of counterpoint, and, a few steps farther, he was held up by one of the Dons, who said that they were in great trouble about the setting of an examination in Italian. "Oh well!" said Mr. Mahaffy, "I can manage it for you." A few minutes later, when we were in the library, he showed me its treasures in the shape of Erse manuscripts and dilated on their value and their contents. As we parted, he said with a sly smile: "I will not give you a letter to Jebb." Jebb and he were engaged in a bitter quarrel at the time, and Jebb knew how to hate. I never saw Mahaffy again. He had the defects of his qualities. His wonderful versatility was paired with an equally wonderful capacity for lapses in thought and statement. "When I took my fellowship," he said. "Salmon told me to go ahead and not mind making blunders." "I have gone ahead," he added, "and haven't made any blunders." "However," he continued after a moment's reflection, "mistakes in such a language as the German, are unavoidable. One of my first publications was the translation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, and some malevolent person pointed

out that I had translated 'unumgänglich' by 'unsociable,' whereas its meaning is 'inevitable.'" "Now," he said, 'Umgang' means 'society,' and why shouldn't 'unumgänglich' mean 'unsociable'?"

Mahaffy lectured several times in America. His fame for errancy had preceded him. He was not invited to any of the great American universities, and his brilliant discourses were delivered to Chautauqua audiences. When I think of some of his misstatements and misinterpretations, I almost regret having called attention to them in the JOURNAL. If Verrall's whimsies were forgiven by his students because 'he made all classics so gloriously alive,' much may be forgiven Mahaffy by reason of his boyish frankness and undeniable charm.<sup>1</sup> When I was in Greece in 1896, my guide, who had been Mahaffy's guide, spoke of him with admiration, emphasizing his readiness in the use of modern Greek. His "Rambles and Studies in Greece" is a delightful book, and when I talked to my classes on Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus, I never failed to quote his description of a spot sacred to the ill-fated hero and the fortunate poet. The further progress of my tour brought me into contact with a number of eminent scholars and not a few pages of the JOURNAL owe what point and colour they may have to association with distinguished members of the guild to which I belong. But reminiscences of this sort are apt to degenerate into mere gossip and though *Brief Mention* is a law unto itself, there are limits to its frank disclosures.

---

Every now and then your Greek scholar, no matter what his special corner of the vast domain, finds his footsteps straying in the direction of the magic garden of the Greek Anthology. One is inevitably tempted to translation, and though I have often deplored the distortion caused by rhyme and for many years was a steadfast advocate of rendering in the measure of the original, my own translations, of which I have given specimens from time to time in the JOURNAL, are under the domination of the jingle. If I have shown a preference for the erotic,

<sup>1</sup> Wit and humour are always permissible for the enlivenment of learned aridities. What dryasdust is so atrabilious as to object to the tone of Van Leeuwen's *Enchiridium* and his gay narrative of the fortunes of the Digamma in the progress of Homeric studies? But whim is to be debarred from serious philological discussion, and so lately, when treating of the phonetics of the same Digamma, I wrote the following protest:

I cannot join with those who raise  
For Albius Varus hymns of praise;  
Lest, raising hymns of praise to him,  
I should raise hymns of praise to whim.



the date of some of them must be remembered in palliation, and, even in the case of a more recent transgression, the amatory poems of "Paulus Silentarius" appeal to the head rather than to the heart. But some time ago I declared my intention to limit myself to the more appropriate sphere of the "Epitymbia," but circumstances over which I have no control have made it impossible for me to indulge in caperings among the tombs, and I must content myself with producing a couple of specimens of this kind of play. I belong to the order of "flagellants," and if I do not inflict the punishment due on myself, I am sure that I shall not go unwhipped of justice.

I wept the death of my Theonōē.  
 Hopes of my child assuaged that grief for me.  
 Now envious Fate hath me again bereft  
 And cheated me, alas! of what was left.  
 Persephone, hark a father's sad request  
 And lay the baby on the mother's breast.

A. P. VII 387.<sup>1</sup>

Five years I'd seen  
 Sans care, sans teen,  
 When ruthless death  
 Stopp'd short my breath.  
 My name runs thus,  
 Callimachus.  
 For me weep not.  
 Although my lot  
 Of life was brief,  
 So was my grief.

A. P. VII 308.<sup>2</sup>

A famous statesman compared the Missouri compromise to a fire-bell in the night. Not a fire-bell in the night, but a death-knell in broad day, was the question put to me by Henri Weil in 1904<sup>3</sup>: Professez-vous encore? Up to that time I had never thought of old age in connection with myself, but from that day I never lost sight of it. So, in a remarkable passage, Dean Swift tells us that up to a certain date he had never thought of death, but that thenceforward death was always before his eyes

<sup>1</sup> Θεονόης ἔκλαιον ἐμῆς μόρον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παιδὸς  
 ἐλπίσι κουφοτέρας ἔστενον εἰς δόνας.  
 Νῦν δέ με καὶ παιδὸς φθονερή γ' ἀπενόσφισε Μοῖρα·  
 φεῦ! βρέφος ἐψεύσθην καὶ σὲ τὸ λειπόμενον.  
 Περσεφόνη, τῷδε πατρὸς ἐπὶ θρήνοισιν ἀκουσον·  
 θές βρέφος ἐς κόλπους μητρὸς ἀποικομένης.

<sup>2</sup> Παῖδά με πενταέτηρον, ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα,  
 νηλεῖς Ἀΐδης ἤρπασε Καλλιμάχον.  
 Ἀλλὰ με μὴ κλαίεις· καὶ γὰρ βίότιο μετέσχον  
 παύρου, καὶ παύρων τῶν βίότιο κακῶν.

<sup>3</sup> A. J. P. XXXI, 117.

like some point to which he was steadily approaching. Weil's question was not unnatural. He remembered our interview of 1880 and knew that I could not be in my first youth. The tone of my reply must have shewed him that he had touched a sensitive spot, and he proceeded to compliment me on my *verte vieillesse*, which somehow means more than green old age. He was evidently impressed by my vitality and, on parting, assured me, using English for the first time, that I was a 'stout Englishman.' Vitality or no vitality, I kept on professing 11 years more, but during that time attentive readers of *Brief Mention* must have noticed how often I have adverted to the gruesome subject, how often I have tempted to apply to my own case the classical symptoms of the decline of life.

One of those symptoms is the propensity to frequent farewells, a failing common to actors and singers who have passed their prime. I remember many such cases. Two especially stand out in my memory. One is the case of Déjazet, who on one of my visits to Paris re-appeared in the rôle of Mimi Bamboche; the other is that of Adelina Patti, whose début I witnessed in my youth, and whose last appearance I saw in Baltimore in 1893, when I christened the diva, "dia apate." So I, too, am guilty of farewells. In the last number of the JOURNAL I bade farewell to Persius.

To Pindar I shall probably never say farewell, until I bid the world good night. But Pindar's farewell to the world is another matter. In my student's years in Germany I was taught to be an admirer of Platen, as I have confessed in my Essays and Studies. Among my favourites was a sonnet on the Death of Pindar. Not long ago, trying to work in the dark, I found that I could recall only half of the poem, but while awaiting a transcript by a friendly hand, the familiar story framed itself into a sonnet of my own, only part of which is due to Platen. The part of Platen's sonnet that escaped my memory betrays his well-known egotism. No one but Platen would have dreamed that a wish for a death like Pindar's would have involved any comparison between the two poets in life or genius. One remembers Balaam's prayer for the death of the righteous. At any rate, I am tempted to tax the indulgence of my readers by reproducing the two versions.

Ich möchte, wenn ich sterbe, wie die lichten  
Gestirne schnell und unbewusst erbleichen,  
Erliegen möcht ich einst des Todes Streichen,  
Wie Sagen uns vom Pindaros berichten.

Ich will ja nicht im Leben oder Dichten  
Den grossen Unerreichlichen erreichen,  
Ich möcht', o Freund, ihm nur im Tode gleichen;  
Doch höre nun die schönste der Geschichten!

Er sass im Schauspiel, vom Gesang bewegt,  
 Und hatte, der ermüdet war, die Wangen  
 Auf seines Liebblings schönes Knie gelegt:  
 Als nun der Chöre Melodien verklangen,  
 Will wecken ihn, der ihn so sanft geheget,  
 Doch zu den Göttern war er heimgegangen.

## THE DEATH OF PINDAR

When I depart on God's appointed day,  
 Quick and unconscious passage be my lot,  
 Like stars' that quit the sky and tarry not,  
 Unlike the comet's train which fades away.

Such was the end of Pindaros, they say:  
 The theatre at Argos holds the spot  
 Where, heedless of the play's soul-stirring plot,  
 The weary bard in peaceful slumber lay,

A perfect image of serene repose,  
 His grey head resting on his favourite's knee;  
 His sleep grew deeper as the play went on;

The play was o'er, the audience rustling rose,  
 The boy essayed to wake him tenderly,—  
 In vain, for Pindar to the gods was gone.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

After forty years of service, service curtailed since 1916 by impaired health and of late by impaired vision, the Senior Editor of the *American Journal of Philology* feels himself constrained, in the interests of the *Journal* itself, to relinquish even the semblance of editorial work. The recent management of the publication, which has been almost wholly in the hands of my friend and colleague, Professor Miller, is an ample guarantee for the future of the *Journal*, which will continue to bear evidence of his sound judgment, exemplary accuracy, and unremitting devotion. At the close of the twenty-fifth volume, I gave in retrospect a history of the *Journal* to which so much of my life has been dedicated. The last fifteen years have added little that is characteristic to the record. The privilege of dying in harness has been denied me, and henceforth I must surrender to the claims of the too long neglected claims of the contemplative life. Rachel must have her rights.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN AND ENGLISH

Aeschylus, Agamemnon. Trans. by Rushworth K. Davis. Cr. 8°. 69 pp. *Blackwell*, 1919. 4sh. 6d.

Dobson (J. F.) The Greek Orators. Cr. 8°. 328 pp. *Methuen*, 1919. 7sh. 6d. net.

Ford (J. D. M.) Main Currents of Spanish Literature. vii, 284 pp. 12°. *Holt*, 1919. \$2.

Hoffman (H. A.) Everyday Greek. *University of Chicago Press*, 1919. \$1.25.

Robertson (A. T.) Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, 3rd ed. *Doran*, 1919. \$6.

Sandys (Sir J. E.) Latin Epigraphy; an Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions; with 50 illustrations. 23 + 324 pp. 12°. *Putnam*. \$3.75 net.

Wilson (P. C.) Wagner's Dramas and Greek Tragedy. *Columbia Univ. Pr.*, 1919. \$1.50.

Wisconsin University. Classical Studies in Honor of Charles Forster Smith by his Colleagues. *Univ. Wis.*, 1919. \$1.

### FRENCH

Lafaille (Commandant) et le lieut. Lafaille. Vocabulaire français-arabe. 32°. *Charles-Lavanzelle*. 2fr. 50.

Reallon (L.) Premiers éléments de la langue douala (Cameroun). Petit 8°. *Émile Larose*. 4fr.

Sicard. Vocabulaire franco-marocain. 12°. *Émile Larose*. 7fr. 50.

### GERMAN

Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Salustii Crispi (C.) Catilina, Iugurtha, Orationes et epistulae excerptae de historiis, recogn. Axel W. Ahlberg. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1919. Ed. minor, 140 S. 1.20 m. + 40%; geb. 1.60 m. + 40%. Ed. maior, VIII, 170 S. 2.40 m. + 40%; geb. 3 m. + 40%.

Caesaris (C. Iulii) de bello civili commentarii. Ed. H. Meusel. Ed. III. 127 S. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1919. Kart. 2.20 m.

Cramer (Franz). Der latein. Unterricht. Ein Handbuch f. Lehrer. XII, 558 S. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1919. 16 m.; geb. 19 m.

Handschriften-Verzeichnisse, Die, d. preuss. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. 14. Bd. 31 x 23cm. Verzeichnis d. latein. Handschriften. 3. Bd.: Die Goerreshandschriften v. Fritz Schillmann. VII, 262 S. Berlin, *Behrend & Co.*, 1919. 30 m.

Lange (Rud.) Thesaurus Japonicus. Japanisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. Lexikon d. in d. japan. Sprache uebl. chines. Zeichen u. ihrer



Zusammensetzungen samt d. verschiedenen Arten d. Aussprache u. d. Bedeutungen. (Hrsg. v. d. Direktor d. Seminars f. oriental. Sprachen an d. Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität zu Berlin.) 2. Bd. V, 641 S. 33, 5 x 25, 5cm. Berlin, *Vereinigung wissenschaftl. Verleger*, 1919. 64 m.

Muench (Wilh.) Didaktik u. Methodik d. franzoes. Unterrichts. 4. Aufl. besorgt v. Prof. Dr. Julius Ziehen. (VIII, 200 S.) gr. 8°. Muenchen, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlh.*, 1919. 8 m.

Texte u. Forschungen, Morgenländische. Hrsg. v. A. Fischer. Gedr. auf Kosten d. Legatum Fluegelianum bei d. Universität Leipzig. 1. Bd. 1. Heft. Fischer (A.) Das Liederbuch e. marokkan. Saengers. Nach e. in seinem (Fischers) Resitz befindl. Handschrift hrsg. uebers. u. erläut. 1. Lieder in marokkanisch-arab. Volkssprache. 1. Photo-lithogr. Wiedergabe d. Textes. XXII, 159 S. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1918. 12 m. + 20%.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich v.) Griechisches Lesebuch. I. Text. 1. Halbbd. 8., unveraend. Aufl. XI, 179 S. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1919. Hlwbd. 3.80 m.

Zeitschrift f. französ. u. engl. Unterricht. Begr. v. M(ax) Kaluza, E(duard) Koschwitz, G(ustav) Thureau. Hrsg. v. M(ax) Kaluza. 18. Bd. 4 Hefte. 1. Heft. 96 S. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1919. 12 m.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Albini, Josephi, Vercingetorix. Carmen in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano praemio aureo ornatum. Accedunt tria carmina laudata. Amstelodami, apud Io. Mullerum, MCMXIX.

Balkan Review. Vol. I, No. 5; Vol. II, No. 7, 1919. London, Published by the *Rolls House Publishing Co. Ltd.*

Billings (Thomas H.) The Platonism of Philo Judaeus. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1919. \$1.00 net.

Bloomfield (Maurice). The Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārcvanātha. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1919.

Cook (Albert Stanburrough). Chaucerian Papers—I. New Haven, Pub. by the *Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 1919. (Transactions of the Conn. Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. 23, Nov. 1919.)

Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Sam. L. Rogers, Director. Mortality Statistics of 1917. Eighteenth Annual Report. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

Festgabe Adolf Kaegi von Schülern und Freunden dargebracht zum 30. September 1919. Frauenfeld, in Kommission bei *Huber & Co.*, 1919.

Fiske (George Converse). The Plain Style in the Scipionic Circle. (Reprinted from *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 3.)

Fox (W. Sherwood). Latinity and Wireless. (Reprinted from *The Classical Journal*, Vol. XV, No. 1, Oct. 1919.)

Greek White Book. Supplementary Diplomatic Documents, 1913-1917, issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Greek Government. Trans. from the French ed. by Theodore P. Ion and Carroll N. Brown. Published for the American Hellenic Society by *Oxford University Press American Branch*, 1919.

Haag (Benedikt). Die Londoner Version der byzantinischen Achilleis. Inaug.-Diss. München, *O. Wolf & Sohn*, 1919.

Inter-América. Volumen III, Núm. 3, 4. Septiembre, Noviembre de 1919. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 39, Part 4, October, 1919. New Haven, Conn., *Yale University Press*.

Knapp (Charles). A Phase of the Development of Prose Writing among the Romans. (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, April 1918.)

—References in Plautus and Terence to Plays, Players, and Playwrights. (Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XIV, No. 1, Jan. 1919.)

—References to Literature in Plautus and Terence. (Reprinted from the *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XL, 3, July-Sept. 1919.)

Merrill (William A.) Notes on the *Silvae* of Statius, Book III. Berkeley, *Univ. of Cal. Press*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 6, Oct. 1919.)

Middleton (G.) Studies in the Orations of Libanius. Part I. Imitations of Classical Writers in Libanius' Orations. Aberdeen, *The University Press*, 1919.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik. 19. jahrg. XXXVII. und XXXVIII. Bandes 1. Heft. 1916. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner.

Ogle (M. B.) Some Theories of Irish Literary Influence and the Lay of Yonec. (Reprinted from *The Romanic Review*, Vol. X, No. 2. April-June 1919.)

Ojibwa Texts. Collected by William Jones. Edited by Truman Michelson. New York, G. E. Stechert & Co., 1919. (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Vol. VII, Part II.)

Oldfather (W. A.) Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur a —, A. S. Pease, H. V. Canter confectus. Pts. 1-3. Urbana, *Published by the University*, 1918. \$2.00, \$1.50, \$1.50. (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. IV, Nos. 2-4.)

Pease (Arthur Stanley). On the Authenticity of the Hercules Octaeus. (Extracted from *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XLIX, 1918.)

Plautus, Menaechmi. Ed. with introduction and notes, by Clara M. Knight. Cambridge, *at the University Press*, 1919.

Price (Helen). C. Suetonii Tranquilli De Vita Caesarum liber VIII. Divus Titus. An edition with parallel passages and notes. Menasha, Wisconsin, *George Banta Publishing Co.*, 1919. (University of Pennsylvania Diss.)

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXVIII, Núm. 3. Mayo-Junio de 1919.

Revista Mexicana. Vol. III, No. 5, August, 1919.

Smiley (C. N.) Seneca and the Stoic Theory of Literary Style. (Reprinted from *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 3.)

Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 60. Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities. Pt. I. By W. H. Holmes. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

——— Bulletin 70. Prehistoric Villages, Castles, and Towers of Southwestern Colorado, by J. Walter Fewkes. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

Studies in Philology. Vol. XVI, No. 4, October, 1919. Chapel Hill, *University of North Carolina*.

Verslag der Commissie voor den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie van het jaar 1919. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1919.

Weiskotten (Herbert T.) Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio episcopo. Ed. with revised text, introduction, notes and an English version. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1919. Princeton Univ. Diss.

Whitman (Charles Huntington). A Subject-Index to the Poems of Edmund Spenser. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1918. \$3.50.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich von). Die Ilias und Homer. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1916. 15 m.

Wilson (Pearl Cleveland). Wagner's Dramas and Greek Tragedy. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1919. (Columbia University Studies in Classical Philology.)

Woods (Arthur). Policeman and Public. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1919. \$1.35. (Yale Lectures on the Responsibilities of Citizenship.)

# INDEX TO VOLUME XL.

- Accents, Greek, (mentioned), 221-222
- Adams, Henry, The Education of, discussed, 336-337
- Aeschylus, Agam. 584, discussed, 223-224
- American Academy in Rome, Memoirs of (mentioned), 108-109
- Anthologia Palatina IX 304, translation of, 223
- VII 308 and 387, translations of, 449
- Apollo Temple, Old, 194-197
- Arrian, Curtius and, 37-63; 153-174
- ax, Verbals in, 373-395
- BASSETT, SAMUEL E. The Theory of the Homeric Cæsura according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine, 343-372
- BATES, WILLIAM N. Review of Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII, 431-434
- BELL, A. J. Tros Tyriusque Again, 198-200
- BENDER, HAROLD H. Review of Lalis' Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbų žodynas and Juškevič's Litovskij Slovari, 321-323
- Benedictus, Magnificat and, 64-75
- Bignone's I Poeti Filosofi della Grecia (rev.), 93-97
- BLAKE, FRANK R. Review of Bloomfield's Tagalog Texts, 86-93
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. The Fable of the Crow and the Palm-Tree: A Psychic Motif in Hindu Fiction, 1-36
- Bloomfield's Tagalog Texts (rev.), 86-93
- Books Received, 115-116; 223-230; 341-342; 454-455
- Brief Mention, 101-109; 218-224; 332-337; 446-451
- BROWN, W. NORMAN. The Wandering Skull: New Light on Tantrākhyāna 29, 423-430
- Cæsura, Homeric, The Theory of the, 343-372
- Case Endings, Declension Exponents and, 416-422
- Centenary of *Don Juan*, The 117-152
- CHEW, SAMUEL C. A Correction, 430
- The Centenary of *Don Juan*, 117-152
- Chronology, Delphian, Problems in, 286-307
- Cicero and the Poetae Novi, 396-415
- COLLITZ, HERMANN. Review of Gaidoz' Deux érudits gallois, John Rhys et Llywarch Reynolds, 205-9
- Correction, A, 430
- Correspondence, 112; 437
- Crow and the Palm-Tree, Fable of the, 1-36
- Cudworth's Odes of Horace Englished into Rimed Verse Corresponding to the Original Metres (mentioned), 107-108
- Curtius and Arrian, 37-63; 153-174
- Death of Pindar, The, Sonnets on, 450-451
- Declension Exponents and Case Endings, 416-422
- Delphian Chronology, Problems in, 285-307
- Don Juan*, The Centenary of, 117-152
- Dravidian S, 76-84
- dus, Verbals in, 373-395
- EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 99-101; 214-217
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Studies in the Veda, 175-193



- Education, The, of Henry Adams, discussed, 336-337
- Fable of the Crow and the Palm-Tree: A Psychic Motif in Hindu Fiction, 1-36
- Farrar's Greek Verb (mentioned), 335-336
- FAY, EDWIN W. Correspondence, 112
- Declension Exponents and Case Endings, 416-422
- FRANK, TENNEY. Cicero and the Poetae Novi, 396-415
- The Old Apollo Temple and Livy XL. 51, 194-197
- Future Participle, The Use and Range of the, 262-285
- Gaidoz' Deux érudits gallois, John Rhys et Llywarch Reynolds (rev.), 205-209
- GILDERSLEEVE, B. L. Brief Mention, 101-109; 218-224; 332-337; 446-451
- Memorial of Kirby Flower Smith, 110-111
- Gladstone's Homeric Studies, discussed, 333
- Glotta, Report of, 329-331
- Goad's Horace in the English Literature of the Eighteenth Century (mentioned), 109
- Harris, Joel Chandler (mentioned), 337
- HAUPT, PAUL. Magnificat and Benedictus, 64-75
- HEIDEL, W. A. Review of Bignone's I Poeti Filosofi della Grecia, 93-97
- Hermes, Report of, 99-101; 214-217
- Hindu Fiction, A Psychic Motif in, 1-36
- Hoffman's Everyday Greek—Greek Words in English, Including Scientific Terms (rev.), 434-437
- Homeric Cæsura, Theory of, according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine, 343-372
- Horace in the English Literature of the Eighteenth Century (mentioned), 109
- Indian Languages, North American, Genetic Relationship of (rev.), 317-321
- JOHNSON, ALLAN CHESTER. Problems in Delphian Chronology, 286-307
- Juškevič's Litovskij Slovar' (rev.), 321-323
- KELLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT. Report of Philologus, 438-444
- KNAPP, CHARLES. References to Literature in Plautus and Terence, 231-261
- Lalis' Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbu žodynas (rev.), 321-323
- LEASE, EMORY B. The Use and Range of the Future Participle, 262-285
- Lithuanian dictionaries, two (rev.), 321-323
- Livy XL. 51, The Old Apollo Temple and, 194-197
- Mahaffy, J. P., 446-448
- Magnificat and Benedictus, 64-75
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome (mentioned), 108-109
- Mendell's Latin Sentence Connection (rev.), 201-205
- MICHELSON, TRUMAN. Review of Radin's The Genetic Relationship of the North American Indian Languages, 317-321
- MILLER, C. W. E. Reports: Glotta, 329-331
- Philologus, 325-329
- Rheinisches Museum, 210-214
- Review of Hoffman's Everyday Greek: Greek Words in English, Including Scientific Terms, 434-437
- MUSTARD, W. P. Brief Mention of Goad's Horace in the English Literature of the Eighteenth Century, 109
- Report of Revue de Philologie, 444-445
- Rivista di Filologia, 98-99
- NICHOLS, EDWARD W. Verbals in -tor, -ax, -dus, and -ns, 373-395
- ns, Verbals in, 373-395

- Old Apollo Temple, The, and  
Livy XL, 51 184-197
- OLDFATHER, W. A. Corre-  
spondence, 437
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII  
(rev.), 431-434
- Palm-Tree, Crow and, Fable  
of, 1-36
- Parmenio's Epigram, 222-223
- Participle, Future, Use and  
Range of, 262-285
- Pauly Realencyclopädie, The  
New, 437
- Persius, Ramsay's (rev.), 332-335
- Philologus, Report of, 325-  
329; 438-444
- Pindar, Death of, Sonnets on,  
450-451
- Pindar, Eighth Olympian, 103
- Platen's sonnet on the death  
of Pindar, 450-451
- Plautus and Terence, Refer-  
ences to Literature in,  
231-261
- Poetae Novi, Cicero and the,  
396-415
- Poeti Filosofi della Grecia  
(rev.), 93-97
- Problems in Delphian Chro-  
nology, 285-307
- PROKOSCH, E. Examples in  
Declension Exponents and  
Case Endings, 421
- Radin's The Genetic Relation-  
ship of the North Ameri-  
can Indian Languages  
(rev.), 317-321
- Raemaekers' Justice, 102-103
- Ramsay's Persius (rev.), 332-335
- Recent Publications, 113-114;  
225-227; 338-340; 452-453
- References to Literature in  
Plautus and Terence, 231-261
- Reports:  
Glotta, 329-331  
Hermes, 99-101; 214-217  
Philologus, 325-329; 438-444  
Rheinisches Museum, 210-214  
Rivista di Filologia, 98-99  
Revue de Philologie, 444-445
- Reviews and Notices:  
Bignone's Poeti Filosofi, 93-97  
Bloomfield's Tagalog Texts,  
86-93  
Cudworth's Odes of Horace,  
107-108  
Gaidoz' Deux érudits gal-  
lois, 205-209
- Goad's Horace in English  
Literature, 109
- Hoffman's Everyday Greek,  
434-437
- Juškevič's Lithuanian Dic-  
tionary, 321-323
- Lalis' Lithuanian Diction-  
ary, 321-323
- Memoirs of the American  
Academy in Rome, Vol. I,  
108-109
- Mendell's Latin Sentence  
Connection, 201-205
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII,  
431-434
- Pauly Realencyclopädie, The  
New, 437
- Radin's Genetic Relation-  
ship of the North Ameri-  
can Indian Languages,  
317-321
- Ramsay's Persius, 332-335
- Schroeder's ΝΟΜΟΣ Ο  
ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, 218-221
- The Education of Henry  
Adams, 336-337
- Wells's First Supplement, 324
- Revue de Philologie, Report  
of, 444-445
- Reynolds, Llywarch, see Gai-  
doz.
- Rheinisches Museum, Report  
of, 210-214
- Rhys, John, see Gaidoz.
- Rivista di Filologia, Report  
of, 98-99
- ROBINSON, D. M. Brief Men-  
tion of Memoirs of the  
American Academy in  
Rome, Vol. I, 108-109
- RUTH, THOMAS DEC. Review  
of Mendell's Latin Sen-  
tence Connection, 201-205
- S, Dravidian, 76-84
- Satura Rediviva, 308-316
- Schroeder's ΝΟΜΟΣ Ο  
ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ  
(rev.), 218-19
- Sentence Connection, Latin  
(rev.), 201-205
- SIHLER, E. G. Tros Tyriusque  
(Verg. Aen. I 574), 85
- Skull, The Wandering, 423-430
- Smith, Kirby Flower, Memo-  
rial of, 110-111
- STEELE, R. B. Curtius and  
Arrian, 37-63; 153-174
- Studies in the Veda, 175-193

- |  |         |   |         |
|--|---------|---|---------|
| Tagalog Texts with Gram-<br>matical Analysis (rev.),   | 86-93   | Use and Range, The, of the<br>Future Participle,  | 262-285 |
| Tantrākhyāna 29, New Light<br>on,  | 423-430 | Veda, Studies in the,   | 175-193 |
| TATLOCK, JOHN S. P. Review<br>of Wells's First Supple-<br>ment to a Manual of the<br>Writings in Middle Eng-<br>lish, 1050-1400, | 324     | Verbals in -tor, -ax, -dus, and<br>-ns,   | 373-395 |
| Terence. Plautus and, Refer-<br>ences to Literature in,  | 231-261 | Vergil, Aen. I 574,   | 85      |
| Theory, The, of the Homeric<br>Cæsura according to the<br>Extant Remains of the<br>Ancient Doctrine,                             | 343-372 | WAITES, M. C. Satura Redi-<br>viva,   | 308-316 |
| -tor, Verbals in,  | 373-395 | The Wandering Skull: New<br>Light on Tantrākhyāna<br>29,  | 423-430 |
| Tros Tyriusque (Verg. Aen. I<br>574),  | 85      | Weil, H.,   | 449-450 |
| Tros Tyriusque Again,  | 198-200 | Wells's First Supplement to a<br>Manual of the Writings<br>in Middle English, 1050-<br>1400 (rev.), | 324     |
| TUTTLE, EDWIN H. Dravidian<br>S,   | 76-84   | Whitmore's Pindar O. VIII,<br>53 ff. (rev.),  | 103-106 |

# LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLS. XXXI-XL.<sup>1</sup>

- ABBOTT, FRANK FROST. Pronunciation of a Final Consonant in a Latin Word-Group, xxxviii 73-81  
Review of Ernout's Textes Latins Archaïques, xxxviii 208-209
- ALLEN, H. F. Five Greek Mummy-Labels in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, xxxiv 194-197
- ALLINSON, FRANCIS G. Menander's Epitrepontes, xxxvi 185-202  
Reviews: Deferrari's Lucian's Atticism, xxxvii 215-216  
Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology, xxxviii 88-93  
Leaf's Homer and History, xxxvii 211-215
- ARON, ALBERT W. Review of Bloomfield's Introduction to the Study of Language, xxxix 86-92
- BALL, ALLAN P. Julius or "Julius": A Note on Verg. Aen. I. 286 seq., xxxiv 81-84
- BASSETT, SAMUEL E. The Theory of the Homeric Caesura according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine, xxxx 343-372
- BATES, WILLIAM N. Review of Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII, xxxx 431-434
- BELL, A. J. Tros Tyriusque Again, xxxx 198-200
- BENDER, HAROLD H. Lithuanian *gaudonž* 'Horse-fly,' xxxix 314-315  
Review of Slovār's Lietuviškos ir angliškos kalbų žodynas, xxxx 321-323
- BLAKE, FRANK R. Construction of Co-ordinated Words in the Philippine Languages, xxxvii 466-474  
Reduplication in Tagalog, xxxviii 425-431  
Tagalog Verbs Derived from Other Parts of Speech, xxxii 436-440  
Reviews: Leonard Bloomfield's Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis, xxxx 86-93  
Seidenadel's Grammar of the Bontoc Igorot Language, xxxi 339-342  
Vanoverbergh's Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco, xxxix 418-420
- BLONDHEIM, D. S. Notice of Schuchardt's Sachen und Wörter, xxxv 114-116  
Review of Clédat's Manuel de phonétique et de morphologie historique du français, xxxix 324-325
- BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. Indo-European Palatals in Sanskrit, xxxii 36-57
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. Fable of the Crow and the Palm-Tree: A Psychic Motif in Hindu Fiction, xxxx 1-36  
Instability of Moods in Earliest Sanskrit, xxxiii 1-29  
Some Cruces in Vedic Text, Grammar and Interpretation, xxxviii 1-18
- BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE. Archetype of our Iliad and the Papyri, xxxv 125-148  
Contributions to the Study of Homeric Metre, xxxiii 401-425; xxxiv 152-171  
Defence of Von Negelein's Traumschlüssel, xxxvi 244-245

<sup>1</sup> This list has been compiled by Miss H. Q. Rigney.



- Latest Expansions of the Iliad, xxxvii 1-30  
 Latest Expansions of the Odyssey, xxxvii 452-458  
 Review of Valetón's De Iliadis Fontibus et Compositione, xxxvi 453-459  
 BOTSFORD, GEORGE WILLIS. Review of Sihler's Annals of Cæsar, xxxiv 85-90  
 BOURGEOIS, H. Review of Dodgson's Guipuscoan Verb of the Year 1713, xxxv 211-213  
 BRIGHT, JAMES WILSON. Necrology of James Mercer Garnett, xxxvii 244-247  
 BROWN, W. NORMAN. The Wandering Skull, xxxix 423-430  
 BROWNE, W. H. On Browning and Tennyson, xxxii 484-485  
 BUCK, CARL D. Words of Speaking and Saying in the Indo-European Languages, xxxvi 1-18; 125-154  
 BURLINGAME, EUGENE WATSON. Compound Negative Prefix *an-a-* in Greek and Indic, xxxix 299-305  
 CANTER, H. V. Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches, xxxviii 125-151; xxxix 44-64  
 CAPPS, EDWARD. Date of Aristophanes' Georgoi, xxxii, 421-430  
*Παραλῶσθαι* in Aristophanes' Anagyrus Fr. 55 K., xxxiii 78-82  
 CARNOY, ALBERT J. Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias, xxxviii 265-284  
 CARROLL, MITCHELL. Review of Bywater's Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, xxxii 85-91  
 CHEW, SAMUEL C. Centenary of *Don Juan*, xxxix 117-152  
 A Correction, xxxix 430  
 CLARK, C. U. Review of Loew's Beneventan Script, xxxv 340-343  
 COLLITZ, HERMANN. Reviews: Gaidoz' Deux érudits gallois, John Rhys et Llywarch Reynolds, xxxix 205-209  
 Meillet's Caractères généraux des Langues Germaniques, xxxix 409-418  
 COOK, ALBERT STANBURROUGH. Chaucer's Griselda and Homer's Arete, xxxix 75-78  
 Petrarch and the Wine of Meroë, xxxviii 312-314  
 DEWING, HENRY B. Hiatus in the Accentual Clausulae of Byzantine Greek Prose, xxxii 188-204  
 Origin of the Accentual Prose Rhythm in Greek, xxxi 312-328  
 DE WITT, NORMAN W. Campaign of Epigram against M. Antonius in the Catalepton, xxxiii 317-323  
 Praevaricatio and Delirium, xxxix 407-408  
 Review of Birt's Jugendverse u. Heimatpoesie Vergils, xxxii 448-458  
 D'OOGHE, MARTIN L. Review of Weller's Athens and its Monuments, xxxv 202-207  
 DREWITT, J. A. J. Genitives *-ov* and *-oio* in Homer, xxxiv 43-61  
*-σσ-* forms in Homer, xxxvi 280-297  
 DUFF, J. WIGHT. Note on the Opening Words of the Odyssey of Livius Andronicus, xxxix 108  
 DURHAM, DONALD BLYTHE. Mimnermus and Propertius, xxxvii 194-205  
 EAKIN, FRANK. Greek Article in First and Second Century Papyri, xxxvii 333-340  
 EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, xxxi 476-484; xxxii 461-468; xxxiii 346-351; xxxiv 221-226, 480-485; xxxv 220-226, 484-490; xxxvi 347-352; xxxvii 95-100, 359-364, 487-493; xxxviii 213-218, 447-452; xxxix 215-219, 326-329, 424-426; xxxix 99-101, 214-217.  
 Review of Trendelenburg's Pausanias in Olympia, xxxvii 475-480

- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Hindu Beast Fable in the Light of Recent Studies, xxxvi 44-69; 253-279  
Hindu Book of Tales: The Vikramacarita, xxxiii 249-284  
Studies in the Veda, xxxv 435-445; xxxix 175-193  
Notice of Von Negelein's Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva, xxxvi 116-117  
Report of Glotta, xxxiii 221-226, 473-480; xxxiv 226-231; xxxv 98-104; xxxvi 352-357; xxxvii 101-106.  
Reviews: Petersen's Greek Diminutives in -*ov* and Bender's Suffixes -*mant* and -*vant* in Sanskrit and Avestan, xxxii 91-97  
Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, xxxviii 435-441  
Wulff's Den Oldjavanske Wirātaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original, xxxix 321-324  
ELDERKIN, G. W. Repetition in the Argonautica of Apollonius, xxxiv 198-201  
ELMORE, J. On Juvenal Sat. I. 144, xxxiii 203-204  
EMBER, AARON. Notice of Spivak's Yiddish Dictionary, xxxiii 214-215  
FAIBLOUGH, H. RUSHTON. Horace's View of the Relations between Satire and Comedy, xxxiv 183-193  
FAY, EDWIN W. Composition, not Suffixation, xxxi 404-427  
Correspondence, xxxiv 497-499; xxxix 112  
Answer to Petersen, xxxviii 228-232  
Declension Exponents and Case Endings, xxxix 416-422  
Derivatives of the Root *stha* in Composition, xxxiii 377-400; xxxiv 15-42  
Derivatives of the Root *bhē(y)* - 'to strike; bind,' xxxii 403-420  
Epigraphica, xxxi 209-212  
Etymological Notes, xxxvi 242-243  
Lucilius on *i* and *ei*, xxxiii 311-316  
Nigidius Grammaticus; Casus Interrogandi, xxxvi 76-79  
Pro Domo Mea, xxxvii 62-72; 156-172  
Sobriquet and Stem, xxxviii 82-87  
Varroniana, xxxv 149-162; 245-267  
West Germanic Preterits with *ē* from IE *ei*, xxxix 291-298  
Notice of T. E. Denison's (Primitive Aryans of Mexico, and a Mexican Aryan Comparative Vocabulary, xxxi 241-242  
Review of Friedrich's Catullus, xxxi 81-90  
FERGUSON, J. F. Review of Husband's Prosecution of Jesus, xxxix 205-209  
FITCH, EDWARD. Apollonius Rhodius and Cyzicus, xxxiii 43-56  
Reviews: Deicke, De Scholiis in Apollonium Rhodium, xxxi 91-93  
Mooney's Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, xxxiv 340-344  
FLICKINGER, ROY C. Accusative of Exclamation in Epistolary Latin, xxxiv 276-299  
FOSTER, B. O. Duration of the Trojan War, xxxv 294-308  
Trojan War Again, xxxvi 298-313  
Review of Hosius' and Philimore's Propertius, xxxiii 330-342  
FOX, W. SHERWOOD. Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum, xxxviii 304-311; 411-424  
Johns Hopkins Tabellae Defixionum = Supplement [68 pp.] of xxxiii, No. 1  
Mummy-Labels in the Royal Ontario Museum, xxxiv 437-450; xxxv 463-466  
Submerged Tabellae Defixionum, xxxiii 301-310  
Two Tabellae Defixionum in the Royal Ontario Museum, xxxiv 74-80

- FRANK, TENNEY. Cicero, Ad  
Att. XV 9, I, xxxix 312-313  
Cicero and the Poetae Novi,  
xxxx 396-415  
Old Apollo Temple and Livy  
XL, 51, xxxx 194-197  
Marginalia, xxxiv 322-328  
Rejected Poem and a Sub-  
stitute. Catullus LXVIII  
A and B, xxxv 67-73  
FRENCH, J. C. Notice of Arden  
Shakespeare (Am. ed.),  
xxxviii 445-446  
FROTHINGHAM, A. L. Grabo-  
vius-Gradvus, Plan and  
Pomerium of Iguvium,  
xxxvi 314-322  
Vediovis, The Volcanic God,  
xxxviii 370-391  
GARNETT, JAMES M. Reviews:  
Chambers' Wyatt's Beo-  
wulf, and Sedgewick's  
Beowulf, xxxvi 207-209  
Cook's Concordance to  
Beowulf, xxxiii 86-87  
Jusserand's Literary His-  
tory of the English  
People, Vols. II and  
III, Pts. 1-2, xxxi 335-339  
A New English Diction-  
ary on Historical Prin-  
ciples, xxxi 460-467;  
xxxiii 83-86; xxxiv  
214-220; xxxv 475-481.  
GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. Cor-  
respondence, xxxix 110  
Memorial of Kirby Flower  
Smith, xxxx 110-111  
Necrology: Harry Langford  
Wilson, xxxiv 116  
Henri Weil, xxxi 117  
Morris Hicky Morgan,  
xxx 243-244  
Samuel Henry Butcher,  
xxxii 122  
Johannes Vahlen, xxxiii 367  
W. W. Goodwin,  
xxxiii 367-368  
Note on Norden's Agnostos  
Theos, xxxv 85-87  
On the Semantics of ΘΕΝ,  
xxxviii 200  
ΟΠΩΣ and ΟΠΩΣ ΑΝ,  
xxxvii 210  
An Oxford Scholar,  
xxxviii 392-410  
Paulus Silentarius,  
xxxviii 42-72

- Seventh Nemean Revisited,  
xxxi 125-153  
Syntactician among the  
Psychologists, xxxi 74-79  
Usque Recurret M<sup>9</sup>,  
xxxiii 447-449  
Brief Mention, xxxi 108-  
117, 234-241, 358-368,  
485-493; xxxii 112-120,  
230-242, 358-367, 478-  
487; xxxiii 105-115, 227-  
241, 358-368, 485-491,  
xxxiv 104-116, 232-242,  
362-371, 486-496; xxxv  
105-114, 227-235, 361-  
369, 491-499; xxxvi 102-  
113, 230-242, 358-369,  
475-478, xxxvii 107-121,  
234-243, 367-382, 494-  
505; xxxviii 110-115,  
222-227, 333-342, 454-  
460; xxxix 99-106, 220-  
221, 427-433; xxxx 102-  
108, 218-224, 332-337,  
446-451. Brief Mention  
contains among other  
things:  
Notices of: Bellermand's  
Translation of the Aias  
of Sophokles, xxxiii 228-229  
Bennett's Early Latin  
Syntax, xxxiii 110  
Bodrero's Eraclito,  
xxxi 108-111  
Bury's Symposium, xxxi 367  
Carpenter's Ethics of Eu-  
ripides, xxxviii 340-341  
Cauer's Grammatica Mili-  
tans, xxxiii 488-490  
Cerrato's edition of Pin-  
dar's Olympians,  
xxxvii 242-243  
Cézar, Métrique Sacrée  
des Grecs et des Ro-  
mains, xxxiii 233-235  
Cooper's Methods and  
Aims in the Study of  
Literature, xxxvii 380  
Cudworth's Odes of Hor-  
ace Englished into  
Rimed Verse Corre-  
sponding to the Orig-  
inal Metres, xxxx 107-108  
Darkow's Spurious  
Speeches of the Lysi-  
anic Corpus,  
xxxviii 455-457  
Mrs. Dragoumis's Tales  
of a Greek Island,  
xxxiii 363-366

- Elliott's *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, xxxvi 113
- Ellis's *World of Dreams*, xxxii 478-479
- Forman's *Clouds* of Aristophanes, xxxvii 114-115
- Forster's *Isocrates' Cyprian Orations*, viz. Evagoras, ad Nicoclem and Nicocles, xxxiii 235
- Gayley's *Classic Myths in English Literature and Art*, xxxii 240
- Grünnewald, *Die Satzparenthese bei den zehn Attischen Rednern*, xxxiv 111-112
- Gudeman's *Grundriss zur Geschichte der klassischen Philologie*, xxxi 113
- Gudeman's *Imagines Philologorum*, xxxii 240-241
- Guglielmino's *Arte e artificio nel dramma greco*, xxxvi 366
- Harris's *Origin of the Cult of Aphrodite*, xxxvii 304-305
- Horton's *In Argolis*, xxxiii 363-366
- Humphreys' *Demosthenes De Corona*, xxxiv 234-235
- Krumbacher's *Legend of St. George*, xxxiii 112-113
- Lamb's *Clio Enthroned*, xxxvii 116-120
- Legrand's *Daos*, xxxii 362-363
- Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen u. Übungen*, xxxiv 362-364
- Livingstone's *Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us*, xxxiv 486-492
- Mackail's *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, xxxiii 226-227
- Manatt's *Aegean Days*, xxxv 105-107
- Manning's *Study of Archaism in Euripides*, xxxviii 339-340
- Masqueray's *Bibliographie pratique de la littérature grecque*, xxxv 109-110
- Morris' *Satires of Horace*, xxxi 115
- Murray's *Euripides and His Age*, xxxvi 233-235
- Murray's *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, xxxi 359-361
- Pascal's *Dioniso*, xxxii 237-240
- Paton's *Fifth and Sixth Books of the Greek Anthology*, xxxviii 110
- Pearson's *Phoenissae*, xxxii 360-362
- Phillimore's *(Philostratos)*, xxxiv 364-366
- Ramsay's *Persius*, xxx 332-335
- Richards' *Aristophanes and Others*, xxxi 115-117
- Ridgeway's *Dramas and Dramatic Dances of the Non-European Races in Special Reference to the Origin of Greek Tragedy*, xxxvii 109-112
- Roberts' *Dionysius of Halicarnassus On Literary Composition*, xxxi 234-238
- Robertson's *Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, xxxv 493-497
- Schöne's *Hug's Symposium*, xxxii 230-231
- Schroeder's *NOMOS O IANTON BAEIAETE*, xxx 218-221
- Shewan's *Lay of Dolon*, xxxii 236-237
- Shorey-Laing's *Horace*, xxxi 485-487
- Steele's *Conditional Sentences in Livy*, xxxii 367
- Todd's *Quo modo Aristophanes rem temporalem in fabulis suis tractaverit*, xxxvi 366-367
- Van Leeuwen's *Prolegomena ad Aristophanem*, xxxi 490-492
- Van Leeuwen's *Wasps of Aristophanes*, xxxi 364-365
- Verrall's *Literary Essays Classical and Modern and Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship*, xxxv 491-493
- Wailes's *Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature*, xxxiii 490-491
- White's *Verse of Greek Comedy*, xxxiv 104-109



- Whitmore's Pindar O.  
VIII 53 ff., xxxx 103-106
- Wilamowitz's Mimnermos  
and Propertius,  
xxxiii 361-362
- Wilamowitz's Reden und  
Vorträge, xxxiv 109-111
- Williams' Aristoxenian  
Theory of Musical  
Rhythm, xxxiii 232
- Wolff's Greek Romances  
in Elizabethan Prose  
Fiction, xxxiii 358-359
- Report of Revue de Philolo-  
gie, xxxix 93-96; 211-215
- Reviews: Goodell's *χρη* and  
*dei*, xxxv 230-233
- Harris' Origin of the Cult  
of Artemis, xxxvii 219-221
- Nilsson's Causalsätze,  
xxxiii 468-471
- Ridgeway's Origin of  
Tragedy, xxxii 210-215
- Robert's Oidipus,  
xxxvi 338-344
- Sandys' Translation of  
Pindar, xxxvii 88-92
- Spratt's Thucydides,  
Book IV, xxxiii 212-214
- GOODELL, THOMAS D. Imagi-  
nation and Will in MH,  
xxxiii 436-446
- GRAVES, T. S. Review of Co-  
lumbia University Shaks-  
perian Studies, xxxviii 93-96
- GREEN, ALEXANDER. Apocry-  
phal Sir Thomas More  
and the Shakespeare Holo-  
graph, xxxix 229-267
- GUDEMAN, ALFRED. Corre-  
spondence in answer to  
Petersen, xxxiv 243-246
- HADZSITS, GEORGE DEPUE. Per-  
sonality of the Epicurean  
Gods, xxxvii 317-326
- HAIGHT, ELIZABETH HAZEL-  
TON. An 'Inspired Mes-  
sage' in the Augustan  
Poets, xxxix 341-366
- HAMILTON, GEORGE L. No-  
tices of: Beeson's Isidor-  
Studien, xxxv 116
- Frenken's ed. of the Exem-  
pla of Jacques de Vitry,  
xxxvi 114-115
- Grandgent's Provençal Pho-  
nology and Morphology,  
xxxv 116
- Grandgent's Paradiso, xxxv 117
- Mierow's Getica of Jor-  
danes, xxxvi 369
- Traube's Vorlesungen u. Ab-  
handlungen, xxxiii 471-472
- Reviews: Bolderston's Richi-  
er's Vie de St. Remi,  
xxxiv 344-347
- Dodd's Courtly Love in  
Chaucer and Gower,  
xxxv 87-90
- Farinelli's Dante e la  
Francia, xxxii 215-218
- Lawson's Modern Greek  
Folklore and Ancient  
Greek Religion, xxxiii 87-90
- HARKNESS, ALBERT GRANGER.  
Final Monosyllable in  
Latin Prose and Poetry,  
xxxv 154-174
- HARMON, A. M. Protesilaus-  
damia Laevii, xxxiii 186-194
- HARRY, J. E. Euripides, Hera-  
clidae 223 (em.),  
xxxv 200-201
- Four Verses of the Phoe-  
nissae (845-848),  
xxxiv 202-203
- HAUPT, PAUL. Magnificat and  
Benedictus, xxxx 64-75
- Omoroka and Thalath,  
xxxix 306-311
- HEIDEL, W. A. Aristarchus  
of Samos, xxxv 446-455
- Notice of Pascal's Epicurei  
e Mistici, xxxiii 115-116
- Reviews: Adam's Vitality  
of Platonism and Other  
Essays, xxxiii 91-95
- Arnold's Roman Stoicism,  
xxxiii 205-209
- Bignone's I Poeti Filosofi  
della Grecia, xxxx 93-97
- Busse's Sokrates,  
xxxvi 332-338
- Jaeger's Nemesios von  
Emesa, xxxv 343-345
- Reitzenstein's Mysterien-  
religionen, xxxi 467-469
- HENDRICKSON, G. L. Epigram  
of Philodemus and Two  
Latin Congeners,  
xxxix 27-43
- Witticism of Asinius Pol-  
lio, xxxvi 70-75

- HEWITT, JOSEPH WILLIAM.  
Religious Burlesque in  
Aristophanes and else-  
where, xxxviii 176-185
- HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN.  
Buddha as Tathāgata,  
xxxii 205-209
- HOSKIER, H. C. Lost Com-  
mentary of Oecumenius  
on the Apocalypse, Pt. III,  
xxxiv 300-314  
Review of Buchanan's New  
Edition of the Codex  
Veronensis. (b), xxxii 220-221
- HUDSON-WILLIAMS, T. K and  
II Forms in the Early  
Ionic Poets, xxxii 74-84
- HUMPHREYS, MILTON W. Re-  
views: Karpinski's Rob-  
ert of Chester's Latin  
Translation of the Alge-  
bra of Al-Khowarizmi,  
xxxvii 354-357  
Winter's Prodomus of Nico-  
laus Steno, xxxviii 201-203
- HYDE, WALTER WOODBURN.  
Prosecution of Lifeless  
Things and Animals in  
Greek Law,  
xxxviii 152-175; 285-303
- JOHNSON, ALLEN CHESTER.  
Creation of the tribe  
Ptolemais at Athens,  
xxxiv 381-417; xxxv 79-80  
Date of Menander's Andria,  
xxxv 326-329  
Problems in Delphian Chro-  
nology,  
xxxix 145-172; xxxx 286-307  
Studies in the Financial  
Administration of Athens,  
xxxvi 424-452  
Review of Tarn's Antigonos  
Gonatas, xxxvi 86-89
- JOHNSTON, CHRISTOPHER. Re-  
view of Harper's Assyrian  
and Babylonian Letters,  
xxxiii 342-345
- KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of  
Romania, xxxi 352-357;  
xxxii 352-357; xxxiii  
352-357; xxxiv 355-361;  
xxxv 354-360; xxxvi 222-  
229; xxxvii 364-366.
- KELLOGG, GEORGE DWIGHT.  
Report of Philologus,  
xxxi 101-107; xxxii 103-  
111, 468-477; xxxiii 480-  
484; xxxiv 100-103; xxxv  
214-220; xxxvi 90-98,  
469-474; xxxvii 222-226;  
xxxx 438-444.
- KENISTON, R. H. Review of  
Post's Medieval Spanish  
Allegory, xxxvii 84-88
- KENT, ROLAND G. Again Lu-  
cilius on *EI* and *I*,  
xxxiv 315-321  
Lucilius on *EI* and *I*,  
xxxii 272-293  
Notices of: Johnson's His-  
torical Grammar of the  
Ancient Persian Lan-  
guage, xxxix 332-333  
Stonecipher's Graeco-  
Persian Names, xxxix 333  
Review of Sturtevant's Lin-  
guistic Change,  
xxxix 316-321
- KNAPP, CHARLES. Cicero De  
Officiis 2, 10, xxxi 66-73  
Correspondence,  
xxxix 108-109, 434-435  
De Quibusdam Locis Primi  
Horati Sermonis,  
xxxiv 329-331  
Molle atque facetum,  
xxxviii 194-199  
Notes on Plautus and Ter-  
ence, xxxv 12-31  
Point in the Interpretation  
of the Antigone of Sopho-  
cles, xxxvii 300-316  
References to Literature in  
Plautus and Terence,  
xxxx 231-261  
Sceptical Assault on the  
Roman Tradition Concern-  
ing the Dramatic Saturas,  
xxxiii 125-148  
Studies in the Syntax of  
Early Latin, xxxv 268-293  
Vahlen's Ennius, xxxii 1-35  
Review of Bennett's Syntax  
of Early Latin, xxxii 333-343
- KNIGHT, CLARA M. *To-Parti-*  
ciple with the Accusative  
in Latin, xxxix 184-192
- LEACH, ABBY. Fatalism of  
the Greeks, xxxvi 373-401
- LEASE, EMORY B. Dative with  
Prepositional Compounds,  
xxxiii 283-300  
*Neve* and *Neque* with the  
Imperative and Subjunc-  
tive, xxxiv 255-275, 418-436

- Use and Range of the Future Participle, *xxxx* 262-285
- Review of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik d. lateinischen Sprache*, *xxxvi* 80-86
- LINDSAY, W. M. *Latin Gram-  
marians of the Empire*, *xxxvii* 31-41
- St. Gall Glossary, *xxxviii* 349-369
- LITCHFIELD, H. W. Review of  
Ernout's *Lucrèce, De la  
Nature*, *livre quatrième*,  
*xxxviii* 322-323
- MCCREA, NELSON G. Necrol-  
ogy of James Rignall  
Wheeler, *xxxix* 110-111
- MCDANIEL, WALTON BROOKS.  
Some Greek, Roman and  
English Tityretus, *xxxv* 52-66
- Review of Mustard's *Ec-  
logues of Faustus Andre-  
linus*, *xxxix* 209-210
- MAGOFFIN, R. V. D. *Latin  
Inscriptions at Johns  
Hopkins University*, Pt.  
VIII, *xxxv* 421-434
- Notices of: Annual Reports  
29-30, and Bulletin 55,  
of the Bureau of Amer-  
ican Ethnology, *xxxix* 222-223
- Barbagallo's *Semestre  
d'Impero Repubblicano*,  
*xxxvi* 115-116
- Chartes et Diplômes rela-  
tifs à l'Histoire de  
France, *xxxix* 107
- Frank's *Roman Imperial-  
ism*, *xxxv* 500-501
- Report of *Revue de Philolo-  
gie*, *xxxviii* 100-105,  
329-330; *xxxix* 329-  
331.
- Reviews: Barbagallo's *Lo  
Stato e l'Istruzione  
Pubblica nell' Impero  
Romano*, *xxxii* 458-460
- Bloch's *République ro-  
maine*, *xxxvi* 212-213
- Clerc's *Aquae Sextiae*,  
*xxxvii* 349-353
- Cuq, *Une statistique de  
locaux affectés à l'habi-  
tation dans la Rome  
impériale*, *xxxviii* 96-98
- Dean's *Cognomina of Sol-  
diers in the Roman Le-  
gions*, *xxxvii* 217-219
- Dottin, *Les anciens peu-  
ples de l'Europe*,  
*xxxviii* 443-445
- Gaselee's *Petronius*,  
*xxxvi* 213-215
- Rosenberg's *Staat der  
alten Italiker*,  
*xxxvi* 209-211
- Van Hoesen's *Roman Cur-  
sive Writing*,  
*xxxvii* 353-354
- MARTIN, H. *Judas Iscariot  
Curse*, *xxxvii* 434-451
- Spanish Inscriptions*,  
*xxxv* 400-420
- MERRILL, W. A. *Lucretius  
and Cicero*, *xxxiv* 496
- MICHELSON, TRUMAN. *Asokan  
Miscellany*, *xxxii* 441-443
- Linguistic Notes on the  
Shāhbāzgarhi and Man-  
sehra Redactions of  
Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts*,  
Pt. III, *xxxi* 55-65
- Review of Radin's *Genetic  
Relationship of the North  
American Indian Lan-  
guages*, *xxxx* 317-321
- MILLER, C. W. E. *Ne Extra  
Oleas*, *xxxv* 456-462
- Nihil quod tetigit non orna-  
vit*, *xxxviii* 460-462
- Note on the Use of the Ar-  
ticle before the Genitive  
of the Father's Name in  
Greek Papyri, *xxxvii* 341-348
- Obituary Notice of Kirby  
Flower Smith, *xxxix* 435
- Notices of: Cereteli and So-  
bolevski, *Minuscule  
MSS*, *xxxiii* 492
- Schubart's *Papyri Grae-  
cae Berolinenses*,  
*xxxiii* 368-369
- Reports: Glotta, *xxxx* 329-331
- Philologus, *xxxx* 325-329
- Revue de Philologie*, *xxxi*  
470-476; *xxxii* 227-  
229; *xxxiii* 100-104,  
216-220; *xxxiv* 348-355,  
474-480; *xxxv* 346-354.
- Rheinisches Museum*,  
*xxxvi* 465-469; *xxxvii*  
226-231; *xxxviii* 106-  
109; *xxxx* 210-214.

- Reviews: Lane Cooper's  
Concordance to Horace,  
xxxviii 323-328  
Hoffman's Everyday  
Greek, xxxx 434-437  
MOORE, FRANK GARDNER.  
Vexed Passage in the Gal-  
lic War, xxxvii 206-209  
MURRAY, A. T. On the Dispo-  
sition of Spoil in the Ho-  
meric Poems, xxxviii 186-193  
MUSTARD, WILFRED P. Later  
Echoes of Calpurnius and  
Nemesianus, xxxvii 73-83  
Later Echoes of the Greek  
Bucolic Poets, xxxix 193-198  
Lodowick Brysket and Ber-  
nardo Tasso, xxxv 192-199  
Notices of: Benedetti's  
L'Orlando Furioso nella  
Vita intellettuale del  
Popolo inglese, xxxv 500  
Breul's Goliard Song-  
book, xxxviii 117  
Caroline Goad's Horace in  
the English Literature  
of the Eighteenth Cen-  
tury, xxxx 109  
Ciampoli's edition of  
Baldi's Ecloghe Miste,  
xxxvi 479  
Cocchia's Introduzione  
storica allo studio della  
letteratura italiana,  
xxxvi 244  
D'Alton's Horace and His  
Age, xxxix 106-107  
Gnesotto's Francisci Bar-  
bari De Re Uxor, xxxviii 342  
Grilli's Poeti umanisti  
maggiori, xxxvi 479  
Hirzel's Das Erbe der  
Alten, xxxiv 117  
Keller, Goethe's Estimate  
of the Greek and Latin  
Writers, xxxviii 118  
Kerlin's Theocritus in  
English Literature,  
xxxii 120-121  
Lidonnici's edition of Boc-  
caccio's Buccolicum  
Carmen, xxxvi 479  
Renaudet's Préréforme et  
Humanisme à Paris  
pendant les premières  
guerres d'Italie (1494-  
1517), xxxix 222  
Sandys's Short History of  
Classical Scholarship,  
xxxvi 244  
Stampini's Studi di let-  
teratura e filologia  
latina, xxxviii 116  
Thayer's Influence of  
Horace upon the Chief  
English Poets of the  
Nineteenth Century,  
xxxviii 116-117  
Ussani's Satire di Orazio,  
xxxviii 117-118  
Wessel's Mantuanus de  
Calamitatibus Tempo-  
rum, xxxviii 118  
Reports: Revue de Philo-  
logie, xxxvi 216-222;  
xxxix 329-331; xxxx  
444-445.  
Rheinisches Museum,  
xxxi 230-233; xxxii  
348-352; xxxiii 96-  
100; xxxiv 96-100;  
xxxv 93-98, 428-484;  
xxxvi 99-101.  
Rivista di Filologia,  
xxxx 98-99  
Reviews: Curcia's Q. Orazio  
Flacco studiato in  
Italia, xxxiv 92-93  
Edmonds' Greek Bucolic  
Poets, xxxiv 90-91  
Gummere's Seneca,  
xxxviii 446  
Kukula's Römische Säk-  
larpoesie, xxxiii 461-465  
Walters' Classical Dic-  
tionary, xxxviii 211-212  
MYRICK, ARTHUR B. Note on  
the Etymology of Invo-  
lare, xxxii 446-447  
NICHOLS, EDWARD W. Sema-  
tics of Latin Adjective  
Terminations, xxxvii 417-433  
Verbals in -tor, -ax, -dus,  
and -ns, xxxx 373-395  
Review of Housman's Mani-  
lius, Bk. III, xxxviii 206-207  
NORLIN, GEORGE. Conventions  
of the Pastoral Elegy,  
xxxii 294-312  
OGLE, MARBURY B. Classical  
Origin and Tradition of  
Literary Conceits,  
xxxiv 125-152



- House-Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-lore, xxxii 251-271
- Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folk-Lore, xxxi 287-311
- Molle atque facetum Hor. Sat. I, 10, 44, xxxvii 327-332
- Stag-Messenger Episode, xxxvii 387-416
- Review of Eitrem, *Hermes und die Toten*, xxxi 93-95
- OLDFATHER, W. A. Correspondence, xxxix 437
- On *Aeneas Tacticus*, xxxix 402-404
- and PEASE, A. S. On the *Keatol* of Julius Africanus, xxxix 405-406
- Reviews: Crusius' *Heron-das*, xxxvi 463-464
- Hahn's *Kaisertum*, xxxvii 92-94
- OLIPHANT, SAMUEL GRANT. *Cæsar*, B. G. III, 12, 1—A Review and an Interpretation, xxxvii 282-290
- Salissationes*, *Sive ad Plauti Milit.* 694, xxxi 203-208
- PATCH, HOWARD R. Review of Cummings' *Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio*, xxxix 83-86
- PEARSON, A. C. On the Use of *ἄρα* with Causal Implication, xxxiii 426-435
- PEASE, ARTHUR STANLEY. On *Aeneas Tacticus*, xxxix 404
- and OLDFATHER. On the *Keatol* of Julius Africanus, xxxix 405-406
- PEPPLE, CHARLES W. Comic Terminations in Aristophanes, xxxix 173-183
- Suffix *-μα* in Aristophanes, xxxvii 459-465
- Termination *-κός* as used by Aristophanes for Comic Effect, xxxi 428-444
- Notices of: Gardikas' Adjectives in *κός*, xxxii 488-489
- Petersen's Latin Diminution of Adjectives, xxxix 333-334
- PETERSEN, WALTER. Origin of the Indo-European Nominal Stem-Suffixes, xxxvii 173-193, 255-281
- Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative, xxxix 1-26, 117-144
- PETERSON, WILLIAM. The Dialogue of Tacitus, xxxiv 1-14
- More about the Dialogus of Tacitus, xxxv 74-78
- POSTGATE, J. P. *Albius and Tibullus*, xxxiii 450-455
- Correspondence, xxxix 109-110
- Vindiciae Phaedranae*, xxxix 383-392
- PRENTICE, WILLIAM K. Review of Drerup, *Das fünfte Buch der Ilias*, xxxiv 332-340
- PROKOSCH, E. Phonetic Tendencies in the Indo-European Consonant System, xxxiii 195-202
- Slavic Analogy to Verner's Law, xxxii 431-435
- Slavic *togo*, xxxviii 432-434
- RAMSAY, ROBERT L. Changes in Verse-Technic in the Sixteenth Century English Drama, xxxi 174-202
- RAND, E. K. *Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod's Works and Days*, xxxi 131-165
- Reviews: Bannister's *Monumenti Vaticani*, xxxv 467-474
- Mustard's *Sannazaro*, xxxvi 203-207
- REES, KELLEY. Number of the Dramatic Company in the Period of the *Technitæ*, xxxi 43-54
- Significance of the Paradoi in the Greek Theatre, xxxii 377-402
- RIESS, ERNST. Review of Tavenner's *Studies in Magic from Latin Literature*, xxxix 199-205
- ROBINSON, D. M. New Greek Inscriptions from Attica, Achaia and Lydia, xxxi 377-403
- Notices of: *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. I, xxxix 108-109
- Zippelius' *Priene*, xxxii 487-488
- Reviews: Baur's *Centaurs in Ancient Art*, xxxiii 465-467

- Fowler and Wheeler's  
Greek Archaeology,  
xxxix 331-334
- Hall's Aegean Archae-  
ology, xxxvi 345-346
- Robert's Pausanias als  
Schriftsteller, xxxi 213-222
- ROLFE, JOHN C. So-called  
Callium Provincia,  
xxxvi 323-331
- Report of Archiv für la-  
teinische Lexikographie u.  
Grammatik, xxxi 96-101,  
227-230, 344-352; xxxii  
98-103, 221-227.
- RUTH, THOMAS D.C. Review  
of Mendell's Latin Sen-  
tence Connection,  
xxxx 201-205
- SAGE, EVAN T. Date of the  
Vatinian Law, xxxix 367-382
- SANDERS, HENRY A. Hoskier's  
Genesis of the Versions,  
xxxiii 30-42
- Reviews: Hoskier's Golden  
Latin Gospels,  
xxxii 218-220
- Vogels' Codex Rehdige-  
ranus, xxxv 90-92
- SANDERS, HENRY N. AN with  
the Future, xxxvii 42-61
- Note on Aristophanes Av.  
1313, xxxviii 232
- SAUNDERS, CATHARINE. Intro-  
duction of Masks on the  
Roman Stage, xxxii 58-73
- SCOTT, JOHN A. Repeated  
Verses in Homer,  
xxxii 313-321
- Phoenix in the Iliad,  
xxxiii 68-77
- Two Homeric Personages,  
xxxv 309-325
- Review of Belzner's Homeri-  
sche Probleme, xxxiii 209-212
- SHEAR, T. LESLIE. Inscrip-  
tions from Loryma and  
Vicinity, xxxiv 451-459
- SIHLER, E. G. Cicero, An Ap-  
preciation, xxxv 1-11
- Cicero, Caesar and Ferrero,  
xxxv 379-399; xxxvi 19-43
- Serviana, xxxi 1-24
- Tros Tyriusque (Verg. Aen.  
I 574), xxxix 85
- SLAUGHTER, M. S. New Col-  
lation of Parisinus 7900  
A for the Epistles of Hor-  
ace, xxxix 79-80
- Reviews: Bouchier's Syria  
as a Roman Province,  
xxxviii 321-322
- Fowler's Virgil's Gather-  
ing of the Clans,  
xxxviii 209-211
- Royds's Beasts, Birds, and  
Bees of Virgil,  
xxxvii 357-358
- SMITH, CHARLES FORSTER. Re-  
view of Classical Papers  
of Mortimer Lamson  
Earle, xxxv 335-340
- SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER. Notes  
on Satyros' Life of Eu-  
ripides, Oxyr. Pap. 9,  
157-8, xxxiv 62-73
- Notes on Tibullus,  
xxxvii 131-155
- Notices of: Merrill's Lucre-  
tius, xxxix 223
- Oldfather, Pease and  
Canter's Index ver-  
borum of Seneca's tra-  
gedies, xxxix 334-335
- Report of Rivista di Filo-  
logia, xxxviii 218-221,  
330-332, 452-453; xxxix  
96-98, 421-424.
- Reviews: Butler and Owen's  
Apulei Apologia,  
xxxviii 204-205
- Byrne's Prolegomena to  
an Edition of Decimus  
Magnus Ausonius,  
xxxviii 320-321
- XAPITEE Fr. Leo darge-  
bracht, xxxiv 206-214
- Clark's Ammianus,  
xxxii 344-347
- Cocchia's Romanzo e  
realità nella vita e nell'  
attività letteraria di  
Lucio Apuleio,  
xxxviii 317-318
- Duff's Literary History  
of Rome, xxxi 222-226
- Leonard's Lucretius,  
xxxix 81-83
- Magnus' Ovid's Metamor-  
phoses, xxxv 207-211
- Marchesi's Apuleius de  
Magia, xxxviii 203-204
- Preston's Studies in the  
Diction of the Sermo  
Amatorius in Roman  
Comedy, xxxviii 328
- Schevill's Ovid and the  
Renaissance in Spain,  
xxxv 330-335

- Vespucci Reprints,  
xxxviii 318-319
- SODEN, HANS VON. Note to  
Der Apokalypse Text,  
xxxv 191
- SODEN, HERMANN VON. Der  
Apokalypse Text in dem  
Kommentar-Codex Mes-  
sina 99, xxxv 179-191
- SOHO, ARISTOGETON M. Re-  
view of Kyriakides' Mod-  
ern Greek-English Dic-  
tionary, xxxi 343
- STEELE, R. B. Endings *-ere*  
and *-erunt* in Dactylic  
Hexameter, xxxii 328-332
- Curtius and Arrian,  
xxxx 37-63, 153-174
- Participial Usage in Cicero's  
Epistles, xxxiv 172-182
- Participle in Livy, xxxv 163-178
- Pompeius Trogus and Jus-  
tinus, xxxviii 19-41
- Quintus Curtius Rufus,  
xxxvi 402-423
- Relative Temporal State-  
ments in Latin, xxxi 265-286
- STUART, DONALD CLIVE. Func-  
tion and the Dramatic  
Value of the Recognition  
Scene in Greek Tragedy,  
xxxix 268-290
- STURTEVANT, E. H. *Γυμνάσιον*  
and *Nudus*, xxxiii 324-329
- Notes on Juvenal, xxxii 322-327
- TATLOCK, JOHN S. P. Re-  
views: Manual of the Writ-  
ings in Middle English,  
xxxviii 441-443
- Wells' First Supplement to  
A Manual of the Writ-  
ings in Middle English,  
1050-1400, xxxv 324
- TOLMAN, H. C. Avestan Par-  
allel in Darius Naḫš-i-  
Rustam, b, xxxi 80
- Identification of the An-  
cient Persian Month Gar-  
mapada, xxxii 444-445
- Review of Meillet's Gram-  
maire du Vieux Perse,  
xxxvi 461-463
- TUKEY, R. H. Reviews: Cook's  
Zeus, xxxvi 459-461
- Norden's *Agnostos Theos*,  
xxxv 81-85
- TUTTLE, EDWIN H. Aryan  
*pitar-* and Dravidian  
*\*pitar-*, xxxviii 315-316
- Dravidian S, xxxx 76-84
- Some Finno-Turkish Par-  
allels, xxxiv 204-205
- ULLMAN, B. L. Horace and  
Tibullus, xxxiii 149-167
- Rejoinder to Mr. Postgate,  
xxxiii 456-460
- Reviews: Pascal's *Poeti e*  
*Personaggi Catulliani*,  
xxxvii 481-486
- Stampini's *Il Codice Bre-  
sciano di Catullo*,  
xxxviii 98-99
- VAN HOOK, LARUE. 'Thought'  
Motif of Wisdom versus  
Folly in Greek Tragedy,  
xxxix 393-401
- VINCENT, PONSONBY M. P. Re-  
view of Dodgsons' Pars-  
ing Synopsis of the 788  
forms of the verb in St.  
Luke's Gospel from Lei-  
carraga's New Testament  
of the year 1571, xxxiv 93-95
- WAITES, M. C. *Satura Redi-  
viva*, xxxx 308-316
- WELDEN, ELLWOOD AUSTIN.  
*Rig Veda I. 32. 8*,  
xxxix 329-330
- Sāmkhya Teachings in Māi-  
trī Upaniṣad*, xxxv 32-51
- Sāmkhya Term, Liṅga*,  
xxxix 445-460
- WHEELER, ARTHUR L. Ca-  
tullus as an Elegist,  
xxxvi 155-184
- Plot of the *Epidicus*,  
xxxviii 237-264
- Review of K. F. Smith's  
Tibullus, xxxiv 461-470
- WILSON, HARRY L. Latin In-  
scriptions at the Johns  
Hopkins University, Parts  
IV-VIII, xxxi 25-42, 251-  
264; xxxii 166-187; xxxiii  
168-185; xxxv 421-434.
- Notices of: Burnam's *Palaeo-  
graphia Iberica*, xxxii 242
- Esther Boise Van De-  
man's *Atrium Vestae*,  
xxxix 242-243

Inama's Teatro antico  
Græco e Romano, and  
of Marucchi's Epi-  
grafia cristiana,

xxxi 368-369

Maurice, Numismatique  
Constantinienne, xxxiii 116

Willis's Marucchi's Chris-  
tian Epigraphy, xxxiii 492  
WILSON, WINIFRED WARREN.  
Partheneion of Alkman,  
xxxiii 57-67

WRIGHT, F. WARREN. Oaths  
in the Greek Epistolo-  
graphers, xxxix 65-74



# G. E. STECHERT & CO.

(ALFRED H. NER)

PUBLISHERS AND IMPORTERS

OF

## BOOKS *and* PERIODICALS

151-155 West 25. Street, New York

Branches at London and Paris

We carry a large line of imported books and receive new publications as soon as issued. Any book not on hand will be imported as soon as present conditions permit.

Our stock of Standard Foreign Books and of second-hand books is the largest carried by any house in the United States and we are equipped to handle promptly and intelligently all orders for American and Foreign publications.

We enumerate a few items from our large stock:

Duruy, V. Histoire des Romains. 7 vols. w. many plates, maps, etc. Paris, 1885. Roy. 8vo. 1/2 mor.....	\$20.00
— Histoire des Grecs. 3 vols. w. many plates, maps, etc. Paris, 1887. Roy. 8vo. 1/2 mor.....	15.00
Gargiulo, R. Collection of the most remarkable monuments of the National Museum. 4 vols. bound in 1, containing 240 plates. Naples, 1870-72. 4to, full gilt morocco.....	18.00
Thue, W. History of Rome. English edition. 5 vols. 1871-82. Cloth, rare	15.00
Maffei, P. A. Raccolta di Statue Antiche e Moderne, data in luce da D. de Romi. With 163 copperplates. Roma, 1704. Old call. Folio.....	25.00
Michel, Ch. Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques & Suppl. bd.....	7.50
Mommsen. History of Rome. Transl. by W. P. Dickson. New ed. revised, 5 vols. 1898. Cloth (\$10.00).....	5.00
Belliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist. Ed. by J. Ch. Cox. New Series. Vols. 1-15. 1895-1909. Cloth.....	23.00
Frime d'Avennes. Histoire de l'art Egyptien. 3 vols. 1 vol. text; 2 vols. atlas cont. 159 plates. Paris, 1878. 4to and folio. 1/2 mor.....	250.00
— L'Art Arabe, d'après les monuments du Caire. 4 vols. 1 vol. text w. 34 plates, 3 vols. atlas cont. 200 mostly color plates. Paris, 1877. 4to. and large folio. 1/2 mor. Nice copy of the large edition.....	150.00
Revue de Philologie. Complete set. 1845-47 and 1877-1917. Unbd.....	280.00
Revue politique et littéraire. Revue Bleue. 1st-3rd series, 52 vols. 4th series, 20 vols. 5th series, vols. 1-22. In all, 94 vols. Paris, 1863-1914. 1/2 mor.....	125.00
Smith, W. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. 3 vols. 1878. 1/2 call. Nice set.....	14.00
— Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. 2 vols. 1878. Cloth....	8.00
— Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. 2 vols. 1876. Cloth.....	8.00
Stephanus. Thesaurus Graecae Linguae. Ed. nova. 8 vols. Londini 1816-1825. Newly bd. in buckram.....	25.00

We wish to buy: American Philological Association: Transactions and Proceedings, Vols. 1-27 inclusive.

# THE LIFE AND STORIES

OF THE

## JAINA SAVIOR PĀRĀCVANĀTHA

By

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,

*Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in  
The Johns Hopkins University*

266 Pages. Octavo. Cloth, \$3.00

Almost from the beginning of Hindu time the Brahmanical religion of India was subjected to criticism and renewed speculation on the part of Hindu thinkers of independent mind, resulting in much heterodox teaching and Sectarian activity. The religion of the Jainas is the older of the two great heretical Sects which grew up many centuries before Christ, the other being Buddhism. Unlike Buddhism the Jaina religion was not founded by a single great religious teacher, but reveres traditionally twenty-four Saviors (Ārjatas) which go back to an unthinkable antiquity. Only the last two of these have any kind of historical standing, and even they are known only by tradition founded upon more or less dubious chronicles. The older of these is Pārācvanātha, said to have been born in 817 B. C. He seems indeed to have been an historical personage; at any rate he figures large in Jaina consciousness, and the doctrines ascribed to him are fundamental in Jaina religion.

The present work contains the fullest extant account of the Jaina Savior Pārācvanātha's life, preceded by nine pre-births, all treated with the care of a chronicle of real life and with the sincerity of devout belief. With this life are interwoven a large number of stories illustrating Jaina morality and doctrine. The Jainas are, perhaps, the best story-tellers of India; the present volume adds to the chain of Hindu fiction books a jewel of no mean price. This work should arrest the attention of students of Comparative Literature and Folklore as well as students of the History of Religion.

Orders should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND,

U. S. A.

